arXiv:1702.08373v1 [math.CO] 27 Feb 2017

Asymptotic enumeration of graphs by degree sequence, and the degree sequence of a random graph

Anita Liebenau * Nick Wormald †

Abstract

In this paper we derive a result that establishes the validity of a model for a basic parameter of a random graph, its degree sequence. Simultaneously, the result gives an asymptotic formula for the number of graphs with given degree sequence, which is also of fundamental importance. The results verify two conjectures of McKay and Wormald made in 1990 and 1997.

1 Introduction

The degree sequence of a random graph has received considerable attention, and indeed was the first major topic dealt with in Bollobás' seminal book [5] on the theory of random graphs. This contained many interesting results, for instance the distribution of the k^{th} largest element d_k of the sequence was determined quite precisely when k is small. The book [1] by Barbour, Holst and Janson contained much information on the distribution of the number D_k of vertices of degree k.

Independently of this, the asymptotic numbers of graphs with given degrees were considered by various authors, culminating in papers giving asymptotic formulae for a wide range of degrees, provided the average degree d is in the range $d = o(\sqrt{n})$ (see McKay and Wormald [15]) or between $cn/\log n$ and $n/2$ for a certain c (see [16], also treated more recently by Barvinok and Hartigan [2] for a wider spread of degrees, but similar density). The complementary ranges, for d larger than $n/2$, are automatically covered. A special case of interest is the problem of finding the asymptotic number of d-regular graphs for $c\sqrt{n} \leqslant d = o(n/\log n)$.

In 1990, McKay and Wormald [16] observed that the asymptotic formulae derived in both the sparse and dense cases can be cast into a common form, and conjectured that this form holds for all densities (except in some trivial cases). The conjecture was shown in 1997 [17] to imply an explicit connection between the degree sequence of a random graph and a sequence of independent binomial variables, which was restated as another (slightly weaker) conjecture.

The two most popularly studied models of random graphs are considered here: $\mathcal{G}(n,p)$, in which n vertices have edges included between each pair of them independently with probability p for each pair, and $\mathcal{G}(n,m)$ in which n vertices have m edges included, chosen uniformly at random from the m-subsets of the unordered pairs of vertices. The connection between the degree sequence of the random graph and the sequence of independent binomials is slightly different in the two cases. We assume that a graph on n vertices has vertex set $v_1,\dots,v_n$ and degree sequence $(d_1,\dots,d_n)$, so that $d(v_i) = d_i$. If G is a (random) graph, let $\mathcal{D}(G)$ be its (random) degree sequence, and define $\mathcal{B}_p(n)$ to be the random sequence consisting of n independent binomial variables $\mathrm{Bin}(n-1,p)$.

*School of Mathematical Sciences, Monash University VIC 3800, Australia. Email: anita.liebenau@monash.edu

†School of Mathematical Sciences, Monash University VIC 3800, Australia. Email: nick.wormald@monash.edu.
Supported by an ARC Australian Laureate Fellowship.

The precise conjecture from [17] is given further below. We first state it in a weaker version that is still very interesting and highly useful. To present this, we first make some definitions. Let A_n and B_n be two sequences of probability spaces with the same underlying set for each n. Suppose that whenever the event H_n satisfies $\mathbf{P}(H_n) = n^{-O(1)}$ in either model, it is true that $\mathbf{P}_{A_n}(H_n) \sim \mathbf{P}_{B_n}(H_n)$. Then we say that A_n and B_n are *asymptotically quite equivalent* (a.q.e.). Given m, set $p = m/\binom{n}{2}$. Then the conjecture from [17] implies that for $p(1-p) = \omega(\log n/n^2)$,

(*i*) $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(n,m))$ and $B_p(n)\,|_{\Sigma=2m}$ are a.q.e.

(*ii*) $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(n,p))$ and $B_{\widehat{p}}(n)\,|_{\Sigma \text{ is even}}$ are a.q.e.,

where Σ denotes the sum of the components of the random vector $\mathcal{B}_p(n)$, and $\widehat{p}$ has a randomly chosen value that is tightly concentrated near p, chosen according to the truncation (and renormalisation) of the normal distribution with mean p and variance $p(1-p)/n(n-1)$. For later reference, we call (i) and (ii) the *binomial properties* of the degree sequence of a random graph.

This opened up a completely new approach to deriving properties of the degree sequence of a random graph. It was shown in [17] that, if true for a given function m (and p), the conjecture implies that general classes of properties of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(n,p))$ can be derived by transferring results from the independent binomial model $\mathcal{B}_p(n)$. (This required showing how to deal with the conditioning on parity, and also the integration implicit in $\widehat{p}$.) The same arguments also apply to the weaker property (ii). It was also observed, from the known asymptotic formulae, that the conjecture holds when $p = o(1/\sqrt{n})$ or $p(1-p) > n/c\log n$. However, the rather large gap, where $p(1-p)$ is between roughly $1/\sqrt{n}$ and $1/\log n$, was left open, as the appropriate enumeration results are lacking. This gap has prevented the new approach being properly utilised.

The condition $p(1-p) = \omega(\log n/n^2)$ is just enough, for both random graph models, to ensure that the number of edges in both the graph and its complement grows comfortably faster than $\log n$. This can be relaxed further if the probability bound in the definition of a.q.e. is weakened from $= n^{-O(1)}$ to, say, $o(1)$, but since such an extension involves only graphs which are highly likely to have maximum degree 1 (or their complements), we do not pursue this.

The following slightly stronger form of the above-mentioned conjecture was made by McKay and Wormald [16] in 1990. It applies to degree sequences that have the degrees in the typical ranges for the random graphs. Here and later in the paper, we use the following notation. Given a sequence $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$, let $g(\mathbf{d})$ denote the number of graphs whose degree sequence is $\mathbf{d}$, let $\mu = \mu(n) = d/(n-1)$ where $d = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n d_i$, and let $\gamma_2 = (n-1)^{-2}\sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - d)^2$.

Conjecture 1.1. *[16, Conjecture 1] For some absolute constant $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$g(\mathbf{d}) \sim \sqrt{2}\exp\Big(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{\gamma_2^2}{4\mu^2(1-\mu)^2}\Big)(\mu^\mu(1-\mu)^{1-\mu})^{n(n-1)/2}\prod\binom{n-1}{d_i} \tag{1.1}$$

provided that $\max_j\{d_j - d\} = o(n^\epsilon \min\{d, n-d-1\}^{1/2})$ *and* $n\min\{d, n-d-1\} \to \infty$.

Here it is only required that $p(1-p)n^2 \to \infty$, which is less restrictive than for (i) and (ii) above because of the $n^{-O(1)}$ in the definition of a.q.e.

The following conjecture is a slightly weaker version but exhibits the relation to binomial variables a little more clearly. Here $\omega(n)$ denotes some function $\omega(n) \to \infty$, perhaps different at each occurrence. The conjecture is written using only slightly different notation from [17]. For this conjecture, we define the model $\mathcal{E}_p$ to be the sequences of length n generated by n independent binomials with the distribution $\mathrm{Bin}(n,p)$, conditioned on even sum. $\mathcal{E}'_p$ is constructed from $\mathcal{E}_p$ by weighting each $\mathbf{d}$ with a weight depending only on $2m = \sum d_i$, such that the value m has distribution $\mathrm{Bin}(n(n-1)/2, p)$.

Conjecture 1.2. *[17] There is a set-valued function $R_p(n)$ of integer sequences of length n with even sum, such that if $p(1-p) = \omega(n)\log n$ both of the following hold.*

(i) For each $\mathbf{d} \in R_p(n)$

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(n,p))}(\mathbf{d}) \sim \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{E}_{p'}}(\mathbf{d}) \exp\Big(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{{\gamma_2}^2}{4\lambda^2(1-\lambda)^2}\Big). \tag{1.2}$$

(ii) In each of the models $\mathcal{E}_p$ and $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(n,p))$, we have $\mathbf{P}\big(R_p(n)\big) = 1 - n^{-\omega(n)}$.

It was shown in those papers that both of these conjectures hold if either $\omega(n)\log n/n^2 \leqslant p(1-p) = o(n^{-1/2})$ or $p(1-p) \geqslant c/\log n$ for some $c > 2/3$. Moreover, it was shown in [17] that Conjecture 1.2 implies all sorts of relations between the degree sequence of a random graph and models of independent binomial variables, far more than is easily gleaned from the binomial properties we mentioned earlier.

Let $\mathcal{B}_m$ denote $\mathcal{E}_p$ conditioned on the sum of the sequence being $2m$. (Note that the value of p is immaterial here.) It is straightforward to check that Conjecture 1.2 holds if there is a set-valued function $R_m(n)$ containing integer sequences of length n with sum $2m$, such that whenever $m(n(n-1)/2 - m) = \omega(n)\log n$ the following hold:

(i) For each $\mathbf{d} \in R_p(n)$

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(n,m))}(\mathbf{d}) \sim \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{B}_m}(\mathbf{d}) \exp\Big(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{{\gamma_2}^2}{4\lambda^2(1-\lambda)^2}\Big). \tag{1.3}$$

(ii) In each of the models $\mathcal{B}_m$ and $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(n,m))$, we have $\mathbf{P}\big(R_m(n)\big) = 1 - n^{-\omega(n)}$.

In fact, this relationship is used in showing that Conjecture 1.1 implies Conjecture 1.2.

In this paper, we introduce a new way to approach the enumeration of graphs with given degree sequences, and prove both conjectures.

Theorem 1.3. *Conjectures 1.1 and 1.2 are both true.*

This theorem is proved in Section 7.

By the remarks above, and using the well known concentration of the number of edges in $\mathcal{G}(n,p)$, we only have to consider m in the range $n^{3/2-\epsilon} < m < n^2/2\log n$ say, for any $\epsilon > 0$. Our results imply in particular that the asymptotic formula for the number of d-regular graphs conjectured in [17] is valid for all functions d of n. Our method is different from those previously used for this problem, in that it relies on the analysis of a set of inductive equations from the perspective of fixed points of contraction mappings. We use essentially the same argument, with some slightly different definitions of the basic objects involved, to obtain similar results for bipartite graphs and directed graphs in Section 8. These results again fill the gap for the near-regular cases, and extend the results of [2, 7, 9, 13, 14].

Our method has a number of possible further uses which are currently being investigated.

We note that Isaev and McKay [10] have given a major further development of the methods in [16] and [2] to obtain further results useful in the case of very dense graphs, and have now also announced results, obtained by pushing this method, for the special case of d-regular graphs through the "gap" and down to the sparse range ($d > n^{1/7}$ or so). Also after our project was well under way, Burstein and Rubin [6] presented a related idea of comparing numbers of graphs with given degree sequences, but from that point onwards the two approaches seem quite different. They do not report any results that are new.

2 Preliminaries and Notation.

We first state a simple result by which we leverage an enumeration result from comparisons of related numbers.

Lemma 2.1. *Let S and S' be a probability spaces with the same underlying set Ω. Let G be a graph with vertex set $V = V(G) \subseteq \Omega$, and $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ be fixed, such that $\mathbf{P}_S(V) > 1 - \epsilon$ and $\mathbf{P}_{S'}(V) > 1 - \epsilon$, $\mathbf{P}_S(v)$ and $\mathbf{P}_{S'}(v) > 0$ for all $v \in V$, and for every edge uv of G,*

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}_{S'}(u)}{\mathbf{P}_{S'}(v)} = e^{O(\delta)} \frac{\mathbf{P}_S(u)}{\mathbf{P}_S(v)}$$

where the constant implicit in $O()$ is uniform. Let r be the diameter of G and assume $r < \infty$. Then for each $v \in V$ we have

$$\mathbf{P}_{S'}(v) = e^{O(r\delta+\epsilon)} \mathbf{P}_S(v),$$

with again a bound uniform for all v.

Proof. For any u, $v \in V$ we may take a telescoping product of ratios along a path joining u to v of length at most r. This gives $\mathbf{P}_{S'}(u)/\mathbf{P}_{S'}(v) = e^{O(r\delta)} \mathbf{P}_S(u)/\mathbf{P}_S(v)$. Summing over all $u \in V$, gives

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}_{S'}(V)}{\mathbf{P}_{S'}(v)} = \frac{e^{O(r\delta)} \mathbf{P}_S(V)}{\mathbf{P}_S(v)},$$

and the claim follows using the lower bound $1 - \epsilon$ on $\mathbf{P}_S(V)$ and $\mathbf{P}_{S'}(V)$. ∎

Let V be a set of size N. To fix notation, we assume $V = [N]$, and let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(N) \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$ (the set of unordered pairs choosable from V) be a set which we call *allowable pairs*. Note that as usual we regard the edge joining vertices u and v as the unordered pair, and denote the edge by uv following standard graph theoretic notation. A sequence $\mathbf{d} := (d_1, \ldots, d_N)$ is called *$\mathcal{A}$-realisable* if there is a graph G on vertex set V such that vertex $a \in V$ has degree d_a and all edges of G are allowable edges. In this case, we say G *realises* $\mathbf{d}$ *over* $\mathcal{A}$. Let $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{d})$ be the set of all graphs that realise $\mathbf{d}$ over $\mathcal{A}$. In most of our notation $\mathcal{A}$ is suppressed, because the set $\mathcal{A}(N)$ is fixed in each of our applications. Parity is an important issue, so we say that $\mathbf{d}$ is *even* if $\sum d_i$ is even, and *odd* otherwise. Throughout this paper, all graphs are finite and simple (i.e. have no loops or multiple edges).

Let $E \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, i.e. a subset of the allowable edges. We write $\mathcal{N}_E(\mathbf{d})$ and $\mathcal{N}^*_E(\mathbf{d})$ for the number of graphs $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{d})$ that contain, or do *not* contain, the edge set E, respectively. We abbreviate $\mathcal{N}_E(\mathbf{d})$ to $\mathcal{N}_{ab}(\mathbf{d})$ if $E = \{ab\}$ (i.e. contains the single edge ab), and put $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}) = |\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{d})|$. (When $\mathcal{N}$ and similar notation is used, the set $\mathcal{A}$ should be clear by context.) Let

$$P_E(\mathbf{d}) = \frac{\mathcal{N}_E(\mathbf{d})}{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d})},$$

which is the probability that the edges in E are present in a graph G that is drawn uniformly at random from $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{d})$. Of particular interest are the probability of a single edge av and a path avb (our notation is chosen with some later arguments in mind), for which we simplify the notation to

$$P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = P_{\{av\}}(\mathbf{d}), \qquad P_{avb}(\mathbf{d}) = P_{\{av,bv\}}(\mathbf{d}).$$

We use $\mathbf{e}_a$ to denote the elementary unit vector with 1 in its a^{th} coordinate. We will use the following trick several times to switch between degree sequences of differing total degree.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $av \in \mathcal{A}$ and let $\mathbf{d}$ be a sequence of length N. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}_{av}(\mathbf{d}) &= \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v) - \mathcal{N}_{av}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v)\\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v)=0\\ \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v)(1-P_{av}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v)) & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Removing an edge av from a graph in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{d})$ shows that the number of graphs with that edge is the same as the number of graphs in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v)$ and *no* edge between a and v. (The general form does not apply when $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v)=0$ only because $P_{av}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v)$ is then technically undefined.) ∎

For vertices $a, b \in V$, if $\mathbf{d}$ is a sequence such that $\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b$ is $\mathcal{A}$-realisable, we define

$$R(a,b,\mathbf{d}) = \frac{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a)}{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b)}.$$

Furthermore, we write $M_1 = M_1(\mathbf{d}) = \sum_{a\in V} d_a$ for the total degree, which is twice the number of edges in a graph G in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{d})$, and $\mu = \frac{1}{2}M_1/|\mathcal{A}|$ for the edge density. We set $\Delta = \Delta(\mathbf{d}) = \max_i d_i$. Finally, for a vertex $a \in V$, we set $\mathcal{A}(a) = \{v \in V : av \in \mathcal{A}\}$, the "projection" of $\mathcal{A}$ onto the edges incident with vertex a, and, with $\mathbf{d}$ understood, we use $\mathcal{A}^*(a)$ for the set of $v \in \mathcal{A}(a)$ such that $\mathcal{N}_{av}(\mathbf{d}) > 0$.

In this paper, we are particularly interested in the following three special cases of $\mathcal{A}$.

- **Graph case.**
  Set $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{gr}} = \binom{V}{2}$. Then $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{d})$ is the set of all graphs G on vertex set $[N]$ that have degree sequence $\mathbf{d}$.

- **Bipartite graph case.**
  Let n, m be integers and set $N = n+m$. Set $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{bip}} = \{uw : u \in [m], w \in [N]\backslash[m]\}$. Then $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{d})$ is the set of all bipartite graphs G on vertex set $[N]$ that realise the degree sequence $\mathbf{d} = (\mathbf{d}^{(m)}, \mathbf{d}^{(n)})$ with one part being $[m]$ and the other part $[N]\backslash[m]$.

- **Digraph case.**
  Assume that N is even and let n be an integer such that $N = 2n$. Set $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{di}} = \{uw : u \in [n], w \in [n+1, 2n], u+n \neq w\}$. Then $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{d})$ corresponds to the set of all digraphs G on vertex set $[n]$ that have no loops and that realise the out-degree sequence $\mathbf{d}^+$ and in-degree sequence $\mathbf{d}^-$, where $\mathbf{d}^+$ and $\mathbf{d}^-$ are the sequences of length n such that $\mathbf{d} = (\mathbf{d}^+, \mathbf{d}^-)$.

We can bound the probability of an edge in a simple way using the following switching argument. We give only the case $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{gr}}$ explicitly; it is easy to derive similar lemmas for the other two special cases above.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mathbf{d}$ be a graphical sequence of length n with $\sum d_i = dn$. Then for any a and $v \in [n]$ we have*

$$P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) \leqslant \frac{\Delta^2}{dn\,(1-\Delta(\Delta+2)/dn)}.$$

Proof. For each graph G with degree sequence $\mathbf{d}$ and an edge joining a and v, we can perform a switching (of the type used previously in graphical enumeration) by removing both av and another randomly chosen edge $a'v'$, and inserting the edges aa' and vv', provided that no loops or multiple

edges are so formed. The number of such switchings that can be applied to G with the vertices of each edge ordered, is at least

$$dn - 2(\Delta + 1)\Delta$$

since there are dn ways to choose a' and v' as the ordered ends of any edge, whereas the number of such choices that are ineligible is at most the number of choices with a' being a or a neighbour of a (which automatically rules out $a' = v$), or similarly for v'. On the other hand, for each graph G' in which av is *not* an edge, the number of ways that it is created by performing such a switching backwards is at most Δ^2. Counting the set of all possible switchings over all such graphs G and G' two different ways shows that the ratio of the number of graphs with av to the number without av is at most

$$\beta := \frac{\Delta^2}{dn - 2\Delta(\Delta + 1)}.$$

Hence $P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) \leqslant \beta/(1 + \beta)$, and the lemma follows in both cases. ∎

We finish the section with giving some simple sufficient conditions for a sequence to be $\mathcal{A}$-realisable. We need this since our degree switching arguments require that $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}') > 0$ for several sequences $\mathbf{d}'$ that are related to a *root* sequence $\mathbf{d}$. We treat the graph case first, for which we have the following.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\epsilon > 0$. Then the following holds for n sufficiently large. Let $d_i \geqslant 0$ be integers for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$, with $\sum_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n} d_i$ even. Then there exists a graph with degrees $d_1, \dots, d_n$ provided that either of the following hold.*

(a) There exists $0 < \mu < 1 - \epsilon$ with $\max |\mu - d_i/n| < \epsilon\mu$.

(b) We have $1 \leqslant d_i \leqslant 2\sqrt{n} - 2$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$.

Proof. Koren [12, Section 1] observed that the classical Erdős-Gallai conditions for the existence of a graph with degrees $d_1, \dots, d_n$ are equivalent to the following: $\sum d_i$ is even, and whenever $S \cap T = \varnothing \neq S \cup T \subseteq [n]$ we have

$$\sum_{i\in S} d_i - \sum_{j\in T} d_j \leqslant s(n - 1 - t)$$

where $s = |S|$ and $t = |T|$.

For (a), it suffices to have $s(n - 1 - t) - s\mu n(1 + \epsilon) + t\mu n(1 - \epsilon) \geqslant 0$. We only need to check the extreme values of t, i.e. $t = 0$ and $t = n - s$. In both cases, the function is easily seen to be non-negative for all appropriate s and n sufficiently large, noting that $\mu \leqslant 1 - \epsilon$.

For (b), we only need $s\Delta - t \leqslant s(n - 1 - t)$ (recall that $1 \leqslant d_i \leqslant \Delta$). Again taking the extreme values of t, only the larger one gives a restriction, being $s(\Delta + 2 - s) \leqslant n$, which is satisfied because $\Delta \leqslant 2\sqrt{n} - 2$. ∎

For our applications to bipartite graphs we need a different characterisation, and to extend it to digraphs we need to specify some edges to be absent. Mirsky [18, p. 205] gave a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a non-negative integer matrix with row and column sums in specified intervals. For the case that those sums are specified precisely, the statement is the following.

Theorem 2.5 (Corollary of Mirsky [18]). *Let $0 \leqslant r_i$, $0 \leqslant c_j$, $a_{ij} \geqslant 0$ be integers for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant n$ such that $\sum_{1\leqslant i\leqslant m} r_i = \sum_{1\leqslant j\leqslant n} c_j$. Then there exists an $m \times n$ integer matrix $B = (b_{ij})$ with row sums $r_1, \dots, r_m$ and column sums $c_1, \dots, c_n$ such that $0 \leqslant b_{ij} \leqslant a_{ij}$ for all such i and j if and only if, for all $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $T \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$,*

$$\sum_{i\in S,\, j\in T} a_{ij} \geqslant \sum_{i\in S} r_i - \sum_{j\notin T} c_j.$$

We use this to show existence of bipartite graphs with given degrees and forbidden edges for the cases of interest, avoiding maximum generality in order to keep it simple. In order to apply this to digraphs, one would set $n = m$ and regard the edges as directed from the first part to the second. For loopless digraphs, we merely forbid all edges of the form $\{i, i + m\}$.

Lemma 2.6. *Given a constant $C \geqslant 1$, the following holds for m, n sufficiently large and $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. Let $1 \leqslant d_i$, $1 \leqslant d'_j$, be integers for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant n$, with $\sum_{1\leqslant i\leqslant m} d_i = \sum_{1\leqslant j\leqslant n} d'_j$. Also let $F \subseteq \{uv : u \in [m], v \in [m + n]\backslash[m]\}$ be a set of unordered pairs, representing forbidden edges, with no more than C pairs in F containing any $u \in [m + n]$. Then there exists a bipartite graph with bipartition $([m], [m + n]\backslash[m])$ with degrees $d_1, \dots, d_m$ in the first part and $d'_1, \dots, d'_n$ in the second, and containing no edge in the forbidden set F, provided that either of the following hold.*

(a) For some $0 < \mu < 1 - 4\epsilon$ we have $\mu \min\{m, n\} > 2C/\epsilon$, $\max_i |\mu - d_i/n| < \epsilon\mu$, $\max_j |\mu - d'_j/m| < \epsilon\mu$.

(b) We have $d_i \leqslant \sqrt{m} - 1$ $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant m)$, $d'_j \leqslant \sqrt{n} - 1$ $(1 \leqslant j \leqslant n)$, and $n \geqslant C + \sqrt{m}$, $m \geqslant C + \sqrt{n}$.

Proof. Apply Theorem 2.5 to the adjacency matrix of the graph B, with $a_{ij} = 0$ if $\{i, j\}$ is a forbidden edge, and $a_{ij} = 1$ otherwise, and with $r_i = d_i$ and $c_j = d'_j$. Note that $\sum a_{ij} \geqslant st - C\min\{s, t\}$ where $s = |S|$ and $t = |T|$. Thus, a sufficient condition for the graph to exist is that for all $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $T \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, with $s = |S|$ and $t = |T|$, we have

$$st - C\min\{s, t\} \geqslant \sum_{i\in S} d_i - \sum_{j\notin T} d'_j. \tag{2.1}$$

To prove (a), set $\sum_{i\in S} d_i = \mu_{1,S} n|S|$, $\sum_{j\notin T} d'_j = \mu_{2,T} m(n-|T|)$ whenever $|S| > 0$ and $n-|T| > 0$, and say $\mu_{1,\varnothing} = \mu_{2,[n]} = \mu$. Thus, (2.1) is implied by

$$st - C\min\{s, t\} \geqslant \mu_{1,S} sn - \mu_{2,T}(n - t)m$$

or

$$(\mu_{2,T} m - \mu_{1,S} s)\Big(1 - \frac{t}{n}\Big) + \frac{st}{n}(1 - \mu_{1,S}) \geqslant \frac{C}{n}\min\{s, t\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Note that $|\mu_{1,S} - \mu| < \epsilon\mu$ and $|\mu_{2,T} - \mu| < \epsilon\mu$. Hence

$$\frac{st}{n}(1 - \mu_{1,S}) > \epsilon\frac{st}{n} \geqslant \frac{C}{n}\min\{s, t\}$$

provided that $\max\{s, t\} > C/\epsilon$, and the first term in (2.2) is non-negative if $s \leqslant m(1 - \epsilon)/(1 + \epsilon)$. Thus (2.2) holds unless $\max\{s, t\} \leqslant C/\epsilon$ or $s > m(1 - 2\epsilon)$.

If $\max\{s, t\} \leqslant C/\epsilon$ then $\mu_{2,T} m - \mu_{1,S} s \geqslant C/\epsilon$ by the assumptions in (a), the second term in (2.2) is always non-negative, and so the inequality holds for n sufficiently large. So we may assume $s > m(1 - 2\epsilon)$.

Since $\sum_{1\leqslant i\leqslant m} d_i = \sum_{1\leqslant j\leqslant n} d'_j$, the right hand side of (2.1) is equal to $\sum_{j\in T} d'_i - \sum_{i\notin S} d_i$. Hence the condition is symmetrical with rows swapped for columns, as are the assumptions, and hence we may assume $t \geqslant n(1-2\epsilon)$ as well as $s \geqslant m(1-2\epsilon)$. The first term in the left side of (2.2) is now at least $\mu(1-\epsilon)m - \mu(1+\epsilon)m = -2\epsilon\mu m$ and the second is at least $3\epsilon(1-2\epsilon)^2 m > 3\epsilon\mu m$, and $\epsilon\mu m > 2C \geqslant C\min\{s,t\}/n$, which verifies (2.2) in this final case for (i).

To prove (b), let $M = \sqrt{m} - 1$. It suffices to show

$$st - C\min\{s,t\} \geqslant sM - (n-t) \tag{2.3}$$

because $d'_i \geqslant 1$ for each i.

First note that the left hand side originated from $\sum a_{ij} \geqslant 0$ and thus $sM \leqslant n - t$ is sufficient. So we may assume $sM + t > n$ and hence also $s \geqslant 1$. If $t \geqslant M$ we then get

$$st - sM - C\min\{s,t\} \geqslant s(t - M - C) \geqslant t - M - C \geqslant t - n$$

by the assumed bound on n, which gives (2.3). So we may assume $t < M$, and so the above conclusion $sM + t > n$ implies $s + 1 > n/M$. Swapping rows and columns as in part (i) we get $t + 1 > m/M$ and hence, as $t < M$, $M + 1 > m/M$. This contradicts the definition of M. ∎

3 Recursive relations

In this section, we derive certain recursive formulae for the probability and ratio functions $P_{av}(\mathbf{d})$ and $R(a,b,\mathbf{d})$. These identities will serve as a motivation for operators that we define in the next section.

Our first result expresses the probability P_{av} and the ratio R in terms of each other and the path probabilities P_{ivj}. The latter in turn are expressed in terms of P_{av} in the next result.

Proposition 3.1. *Let* $\mathbf{d}$ *be a sequence of length* N *and let* $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$.

(a) *Let* $a, v \in V$. *If* $\mathcal{N}_{av}(\mathbf{d}) > 0$ *then*

$$P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = d_v \left(\sum_{b\in\mathcal{A}^*(v)} R(b,a;\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_v) \frac{1 - P_{bv}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b-\mathbf{e}_v)}{1 - P_{av}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v)} \right)^{-1}.$$

(b) *Let* $a, b \in V$. *If* $\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_b$ *is* $\mathcal{A}$*-realisable then*

$$R(a,b;\mathbf{d}) = \frac{d_a}{d_b} \cdot \frac{1 - B(a,b,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b)}{1 - B(b,a,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a)}, \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$B(i,j,\mathbf{d}') = \frac{1}{d_i} \left(\sum_{v\in\mathcal{A}(i)\setminus\mathcal{A}(j)} P_{iv}(\mathbf{d}') + \sum_{v\in\mathcal{A}(i)\cap\mathcal{A}(j)} P_{ivj}(\mathbf{d}') \right), \tag{3.2}$$

provided that $B(b,a,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a) \neq 1$.

Remarks

1. The summation over all b in $\mathcal{A}^*(v)$ in (a) (instead of $\mathcal{A}(v)$) is merely for the technicality that $P_{bv}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b-\mathbf{e}_v)$ is otherwise undefined.

2. The condition $\mathcal{N}_{av} > 0$ in part (a) does not reduce the practical usefulness of the lemma since the degree sequences where this condition fails for allowable edges av with $d_a, d_v > 0$ are pathological enough that our method fails for other reasons.

3. Let us comment on the range of the summations in $B(i,j,\mathbf{d}')$ in the three special cases. In the graph case, $\mathcal{A}(i)\backslash\mathcal{A}(j) = \{j\}$ and $\mathcal{A}(i) \cap \mathcal{A}(j) = [n]\backslash\{i,j\}$. In the bipartite case, we apply Proposition 3.1(b) only when $i, j \in [n]$. In this case, $\mathcal{A}(i) = \mathcal{A}(j) = [N]\backslash[n]$, and hence the first sum in $B(i,j,\mathbf{d}')$ is empty whereas the second sum is over all $v \in [N]\backslash[n]$. In the digraph case, we apply Proposition 3.1(b) only when $i, j \in [n]$. In this case, $\mathcal{A}(i)\backslash\mathcal{A}(j) = \{j+n\}$ and $\mathcal{A}(i) \cap \mathcal{A}(j) = ([N]\backslash[n])\backslash\{i+n, j+n\}$).

Proof. To prove part (a) of the lemma, let $\mathbf{d}$ be an $\mathcal{A}$-realisable sequence. Then every graph $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{d})$ contributes exactly d_v to $\sum_{b\in\mathcal{A}^*(v)} \mathcal{N}_{bv}(\mathbf{d})$. Hence, since $\mathcal{N}_{av}(\mathbf{d}) > 0$ we may write

$$\begin{aligned} d_v &= \sum_{b\in\mathcal{A}^*(v)} \frac{\mathcal{N}_{bv}(\mathbf{d})}{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d})} = P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) \sum_{b\in\mathcal{A}^*(v)} \frac{\mathcal{N}_{bv}(\mathbf{d})}{\mathcal{N}_{av}(\mathbf{d})} \\ &= P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) \sum_{b\in\mathcal{A}^*(v)} \frac{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b-\mathbf{e}_v)(1-P_{bv}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b-\mathbf{e}_v))}{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v)(1-P_{av}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v))}, \end{aligned}$$

by Observation 2.2, noting that $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b-\mathbf{e}_v) \geqslant \mathcal{N}_{bv}(\mathbf{d}) > 0$ by defnition of $\mathcal{A}^*(v)$. Part (a) follows since by definition

$$\frac{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b-\mathbf{e}_v)}{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v)} = R(b,a;\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_v),$$

and also noting that the summation is non-zero because $a \in \mathcal{A}^*(v)$.

To prove part (b) of the lemma, assume that $\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b$ is $\mathcal{A}$-realisable. Let J_1 be the set of graphs in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b)$ with a distinguished edge incident to vertex a, and J_2 the set of graphs in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a)$ with a distinguished edge incident to b. Then $|J_1| = d_a\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b)$ and $|J_2| = d_b\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a)$. Applying a *degree switching* to $G \in J_1$ consists of deleting the distinguished edge av and adding a new distinguished edge bv, to produce a graph $G' \in J_2$. The degree switching cannot be performed, i.e. is not valid, if $bv \notin \mathcal{A}$, which includes the case that $v = b$, or bv is an edge of G. Now let $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b)$ be picked uniformly at random and let v be a random neighbour of a in G. Let E be the event $E_{\mathcal{A}} \cup E_D$ where $E_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the event that $bv \notin \mathcal{A}$ and E_D is the event that bv is an edge of G, and define $B(b,v,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b) = \mathbf{P}(E)$ (which we show further below to satisfy (3.2)). Then the number of valid degree switchings is

$$d_a\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e_b})(1-B(a,b,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b)).$$

We may count the same switchings from the other direction, i.e. starting with an element of J_2, using the same argument, and in this case $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a) = 0$ is permissible. Equating the two counts gives

$$\frac{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a)}{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e_b})} = \frac{d_a}{d_b} \cdot \frac{1-B(a,b,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b)}{1-B(b,a,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a)},$$

where the denominator is non-zero by the hypotheses of (b), noting that $d_b > 0$ because $\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b$ is $\mathcal{A}$-realisable. This gives (3.1).

The event E_D can only happen if the vertex v is a neighbour both of a and of v, and hence

$$\mathbf{P}(E_D) = \frac{1}{d_a} \sum_{v\in\mathcal{A}(a)\cap\mathcal{A}(b)} P_{avb}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b).$$

On the other hand, the vertex v is always a neighbour of a in a graph $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{d})$, and thus

$$\mathbf{P}(E_{\mathcal{A}}) = \mathbf{P}(\{v \notin \mathcal{A}(b)\}) = \mathbf{P}(\{v \in \mathcal{A}(a)\backslash\mathcal{A}(b)\}) = \frac{1}{d_a} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{A}(a)\backslash\mathcal{A}(b)} P_{av}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_b).$$

Noting that $E_{\mathcal{A}} \cap E_D = \varnothing$, so $\mathbf{P}(E) = \mathbf{P}(E_{\mathcal{A}}) + \mathbf{P}(E_D)$, we obtain the stated formula for $B(a, b, \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_b)$. The case of $B(b, a, \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a)$ is the same but in reverse. ∎

We now address the evaluation of $P_{avb}(\mathbf{d})$. The inequalities in the hypotheses are straightforward to verify in each application. As usual, the empty product is 1.

Lemma 3.2. *Let N be an integer, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \binom{[N]}{2}$, and let $a, v, b \in [N]$ such that $a \neq b$ and $av, bv \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $k_0 \geqslant 1$ and assume that $0 < \mathcal{N}_{av}(\mathbf{d} - k\mathbf{e}_a - k\mathbf{e}_v) < \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d} - k\mathbf{e}_a - k\mathbf{e}_v)$ for $0 \leqslant k \leqslant k_0$. Then*

$$P_{avb}(\mathbf{d}) \bowtie \frac{P_{av}(\mathbf{d})}{1 - P_{av}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v)} \cdot \Sigma^{k_0}$$

where

$$\Sigma^{k_0} = \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} (-1)^{k-1} P_{bv}(\mathbf{d} - k(\mathbf{e}_a + \mathbf{e}_v)) \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{P_{av}(\mathbf{d} - j(\mathbf{e}_a + \mathbf{e}_v))}{1 - P_{av}(\mathbf{d} - (j+1)(\mathbf{e}_a + \mathbf{e}_v))},$$

$\Sigma^{k_0}(\mathbf{p})$. with $\bowtie$ denoting '$=$' when $\mathcal{N}_{\{av,bv\}}(\mathbf{d} - k_0(\mathbf{e}_a + \mathbf{e}_v)) = 0$, and otherwise '$\leqslant$' for k_0 odd and '$\geqslant$' for k_0 even.

Proof. The assumptions imply that $\mathcal{N}_{av}(\mathbf{d}) > 0$, and hence by definition,

$$P_{avb}(\mathbf{d}) = \frac{\mathcal{N}_{\{av,bv\}}(\mathbf{d})}{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d})} = P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) \cdot \frac{\mathcal{N}_{\{av,bv\}}(\mathbf{d})}{\mathcal{N}_{av}(\mathbf{d})}. \tag{3.3}$$

Immediately (c.f. the proof of Lemma 2.2), and then using iteration for the second line,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}_{\{av,bv\}}(\mathbf{d}) &= \mathcal{N}_{bv}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v) - \mathcal{N}_{\{av,bv\}}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v) \\ &= (-1)^{k_0} \mathcal{N}_{\{av,bv\}}(\mathbf{d} - k_0\mathbf{e}_a - k_0\mathbf{e}_v) + \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} (-1)^{k-1} \mathcal{N}_{bv}(\mathbf{d} - k\mathbf{e}_a - k\mathbf{e}_v).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d} - k\mathbf{e}_a - k\mathbf{e}_v) > 0$ for $0 \leqslant k \leqslant k_0$ by assumption, we have $P_{bv}(\mathbf{d} - k\mathbf{e}_a - k\mathbf{e}_v)$ well defined and so

$$\mathcal{N}_{\{av,bv\}}(\mathbf{d}) = (-1)^{k_0}\xi + \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} (-1)^{k-1} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d} - k\mathbf{e}_a - k\mathbf{e}_v) \cdot P_{bv}(\mathbf{d} - k\mathbf{e}_a - k\mathbf{e}_v)$$

where $\xi = \mathcal{N}_{\{av,bv\}}(\mathbf{d} - k_0\mathbf{e}_a - k_0\mathbf{e}_v) \geqslant 0$. Applying Lemma 2.2 and (3.3) now gives

$$P_{avb}(\mathbf{d}) \bowtie P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} (-1)^{k-1} \frac{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d} - k\mathbf{e}_a - k\mathbf{e}_v)}{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v)} \cdot \frac{P_{bv}(\mathbf{d} - k\mathbf{e}_a - k\mathbf{e}_v)}{1 - P_{av}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v)},$$

(with "$\bowtie$" defined as in the lemma statement). The lemma follows once we have shown that

$$\frac{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d} - k\mathbf{e}_a - k\mathbf{e}_v))}{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v)} = \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{P_{av}(\mathbf{d} - j(\mathbf{e}_a + \mathbf{e}_v))}{1 - P_{av}(\mathbf{d} - (j+1)(\mathbf{e}_a + \mathbf{e}_v))}. \tag{3.4}$$

For $\mathbf{d}' = \mathbf{d} - j(\mathbf{e}_a + \mathbf{e}_v)$, we have

$$P_{av}(\mathbf{d}') = \frac{\mathcal{N}_{av}(\mathbf{d}')}{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}')} = \frac{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}' - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v)}{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}')} \cdot (1 - P_{av}(\mathbf{d}' - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v)),$$

and we have $1 - P_{av}(\mathbf{d}' - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v) > 0$ by the assumption that $\mathcal{N}_{av}(\mathbf{d} - k\mathbf{e}_a - k\mathbf{e}_v) < \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d} - k\mathbf{e}_a - k\mathbf{e}_v)$. Hence, the product in (3.4) telescopes to become the left hand side. ∎

4 Sparse case for graphs

In this section we illustrate how the recursive relations found in Section 3 can be used, by providing a new derivation of a known formula for the number of graphs with a given sparse degree sequence. The same approach is also effective for duplicating known results on sparse bipartite graphs and digraphs.

We note that the error bounds in the following theorem are easily strengthened by carrying out the expansions a little further, which would permit the scope to be increased, and it is quite straightforward to extend known results in this manner. In fact, this is how we first obtained the formulae in Section 5. Having done that, there is no longer a need to iterate the formulae as in the present section.

Recall that for a sequence $\mathbf{d}$ we write $\Delta = \Delta(\mathbf{d}) = \max_i d_i$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let n be an integer and let $\mathcal{D}$ be the set of sequences of length n satisfying $\Delta(\mathbf{d}) = o(n^{1/9})$ and $d_i \geqslant 1$ for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$. Then for all even sequences $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}$ we have $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{G}(n,m)}(\mathbf{d}) \sim \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{B}_m}(\mathbf{d})$.*

Proof. We first show that all odd sequences $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfy

$$R(a,b,\mathbf{d}) = \frac{d_a}{d_b}\left(1 + \frac{(d_a - d_b)(M_1 + M_2)}{M_1^2}\right)\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\Delta^8}{n^2}\right)\right) \tag{4.1}$$

for all $a, b \in [n]$. (In making such statements, we are asserting that the bound in $O()$ is uniform over all such $\mathbf{d}$.) For an integer $r \geqslant 0$, denote by $Q_r^0(\mathcal{D})$ (or $Q_r^1(\mathcal{D})$) the set of all even (or odd, respectively) sequences $\mathbf{d}$ with all entries non-negative that are at L_1 distance at most r from a sequence in $\mathcal{D}$. Note that in $\mathbf{d} \in Q_r^0(\mathcal{D}) \cup Q_r^1(\mathcal{D})$, at most r coordinates may be zero.

First note that $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}) > 0$ for all $\mathbf{d} \in Q_9^0(\mathcal{D})$ by Lemma 2.4(b) applied to the sequence formed by the $n - O(1)$ non-zero coordinates of $\mathbf{d}$. After this, Lemma 2.3 implies (noting that $d > 1 - o(1)$)

$$P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = O(\Delta^2/n) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{d} \in Q_9^0(\mathcal{D}) \text{ and all } a \neq v. \tag{4.2}$$

Next consider any distinct $a, v, b \in [n]$ and $\mathbf{d} \in Q_7^0(\mathcal{D})$, with $d_a > 0$ and $d_v > 0$. Then $\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v \in Q_9^0$ and hence $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v) > 0$ from above, and $P_{av}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v) = O(\Delta^2/n) < 1$ for n sufficiently large. Thus $\mathcal{N}_{av}(\mathbf{d}) > 0$ by Lemma 2.2, and we have $\mathcal{N}_{av}(\mathbf{d}) < \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d})$ since $P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) < 1$ by (4.2). This establishes the hypotheses for $\mathcal{N}_{av}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ in Lemma 3.2 for bounding $P_{avb}(\mathbf{d})$ whenever $d_a \geqslant k_0$ and $d_v \geqslant k_0$, and in Proposition 3.1 for $P_{av}(\mathbf{d})$ whenever $d_a \geqslant 1$ and $d_v \geqslant 1$.

We now deduce that $P_{avb}(\mathbf{d}) = O(\Delta^4/n^2)$ for $\mathbf{d} \in Q_7^0(\mathcal{D})$; if d_a or d_v is 0 then this is immediate, and otherwise it follows from Lemma 3.2 with $k_0 = 1$ in view of (4.2). Next, definition (3.2) yields $B(a,b,\mathbf{d}) = O(\Delta^4/n)$ for all distinct $a, b \in [n]$ and all $\mathbf{d} \in Q_7^0(\mathcal{D})$ with $d_a > 0$ ($|\mathcal{A}(i) \backslash \mathcal{A}(j)|$ is always 1 in the current setting). Thus (3.1) gives $R(a,b,\mathbf{d}) = d_a/d_b(1 + O(\Delta^4/n))$ for all $\mathbf{d} \in Q_6^1(\mathcal{D})$ and all distinct a, b such that d_a, $d_b > 0$. Note that only $O(1)$ coordinates of $\mathbf{d}$ may be 0. If moreover $d_v > 0$, we have $\mathcal{N}_{bv}(\mathbf{d}) > 0$ as noted above. Therefore $|\mathcal{A}^*(v)| = n - O(1)$ which implies $\sum_{b \in \mathcal{A}^*(v)} d_b = M_1 - d_v$. Thus, Proposition 3.1 gives $P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = d_a d_v / M_1(1 + O(\Delta^4/n))$ for all $\mathbf{d} \in Q_5^0(\mathcal{D})$ and $av \in \binom{[n]}{2}$. (If d_a and d_v are nonzero, the proposition applies as mentioned above, and if either is 0, the claim holds trivially.)

Using a similar argument, Lemma 3.2 with $k_0 = \min\{2, d_a, d_v\}$ gives

$$P_{avb}(\mathbf{d}) = \frac{d_a [d_v]_2 d_b}{M_1^2}\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\Delta^4}{n}\right)\right)$$

for all $\mathbf{d} \in Q_1^0(\mathcal{D})$ and all distinct $a, v, b \in [n]$. (Note that perturbing an entry of $\mathbf{d}$ by $O(1)$, as in considering a sequence of distance $O(1)$ from $\mathbf{d}$, changes M_1 by a factor $1 + O(1/n)$.) Applying the definition of B in Proposition 3.1(b) to $\mathbf{d} \in Q_1^0(\mathcal{D})$ and distinct $a, b \in [n]$, defining $M_2 = M_2(\mathbf{d}) = \sum_{v \in [n]} d_v(d_v - 1)$ and noting that $M_2 \leqslant \Delta M_1$ and $M_1 \geqslant n - O(1)$, gives

$$B(a, b, \mathbf{d}) = \left(\frac{d_b}{M_1} + \frac{d_b M_2}{M_1^2}\right)\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\Delta^4}{n}\right)\right).$$

Thus, for all odd $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}$ and all a, b, and noting that M_2 changes by a factor $1 + O(\Delta/n)$ under bounded perturbations of its argument,

$$R(a, b, \mathbf{d}) = \frac{d_a}{d_b}\frac{\left(1 - d_b/M_1 - (d_b - 1)M_2/M_1^2\right)}{\left(1 - d_a/M_1 - (d_a - 1)M_2/M_1^2\right)}\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\Delta^8}{n^2}\right)\right),$$

which implies (4.1).

Now let $H(\mathbf{d})$ denote the conjectured formula in the right hand side of (1.1). Noting that $\lambda = M_1/n(n-1)$ is the same for both cases $\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a$ and $\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_b$, we have (for *all* even $\mathbf{d}$ with $\Delta < n - 1$ and $\lambda > 0$)

$$\frac{H(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a)}{H(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_b)} = \frac{d_a(n - 1 - d_b)}{d_b(n - 1 - d_a)} \exp\left(\frac{4(d_a - d_b)\gamma_2}{(n-1)^2(4\lambda^2(1-\lambda)^2)}\right) \tag{4.3}$$

where we recall, and then compute, that $\gamma_2 = \gamma_2(\mathbf{d}) = (n-1)^{-2}\sum_i (d_i - (M_1/n))^2 = (M_2 + M_1 - M_1^2/n)/(n-1)^2$. For $\Delta(\mathbf{d}) = o(n^{1/8})$, the exponential factor is $(d_b - d_a)(M_2 + M_1 - M_1^2/n)/M_1^2(1 + O(\Delta/n)$, and it follows that

$$R(a, b, \mathbf{d}) = \frac{H(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a)}{H(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_b)}\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\Delta^8}{n^2}\right)\right).$$

Since $\Delta = o(n^{1/9})$, we have $d := M_1/n = o(n^{1/9})$. Put $m = nd/2$. We will shortly apply Lemma 2.1 to the two probability spaces $\mathcal{B}_m(n)$ and $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(n, m))$. In $\mathcal{G}(n, m)$, each vertex degree d_i is distributed hypergeometrically with expected value d, and hence for large n

$$\mathbf{P}(d_i > d + n^{1/10}) < \exp(n^{-1/15})$$

by [11, Theorem 2.10 and Corollary 2.3] for example. The same holds, by the same argument, in $\mathcal{B}_m(n)$. Let V be the set of even sequences that fail all of those inequalities. Then, for large n, we may put $\epsilon = n\exp(n^{-1/15}) = o(1)$ in Lemma 2.1 by the union bound. We define the graph G with vertex set V by declaring that two vertices (sequences) are adjacent if they are of the form $\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a$, $\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_b$ for some a and b in $[n]$. Then it is clear that the diameter of G is $r = o(n^{10/9})$. From (4.1) and (4.3) and $\Delta = o(n^{1/8})$, we may set $\delta = o(n^{-10/9})$. Hence $r\delta + \epsilon = o(1)$, and Lemma 2.1 then gives the theorem. ∎

Theorem 1.3 follows from this in the sparse case, considering the remarks after it in the introduction.

5 Function operators

In the previous section we used two iterations of the recursive equations from Proposition 3.1, each time applying them to all degree sequences at a certain distance from a root sequence $\mathbf{d}$. This

allowed us to determine the ratio $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a)/\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b)$ up to negligible error terms. For denser graphs we would need an unbounded number of iterations to obtain the desired precision of about $O(1/n\sqrt{d})$ since the improvement is $O(\Delta/n)$ each time. Instead of doing this, we define operators based on the recursive identities from Proposition 3.1 and study their behaviour on input functions that are close to the desired functions.

Let $\Omega = \Omega(N)$ denote the set of non-negative integer sequences of length N. For a given integer N and a set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \binom{[N]}{2}$ we define $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ to be the set of ordered pairs (u,v) with $\{uv\} \in \mathcal{A}$. Ordered pairs are needed here because, although the functions of interest are symmetric in the sense that the probability of an edge uv is the same as vu, our approximations to the probability do not obey this symmetry.

Given $\mathbf{p} : \vec{\mathcal{A}} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, we write $\mathbf{p}_{av}(\mathbf{d})$ for $\mathbf{p}(a,v,\mathbf{d})$, and alert the reader to avoid confusing the ordered subscripts $av \neq va$ with the edge $av = va$. We next define an associated function $\mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d})$ as follows. For $\mathbf{d} \in \Omega$ and $av, bv \in \mathcal{A}$, and integer $k_0 \geqslant 1$, we set

$$\mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d}) = (\mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d}))(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{\mathbf{p}_{av}(\mathbf{d})}{1-\mathbf{p}_{av}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v)} \cdot \Sigma^{k_0}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{d},a,v,b), \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$\Sigma^{k_0}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{d},a,v,b) = \sum_{k=1}^{k_0}(-1)^{k-1}\mathbf{p}_{bv}(\mathbf{d}-k(\mathbf{e}_a+\mathbf{e}_v))\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}\frac{\mathbf{p}_{av}(\mathbf{d}-j(\mathbf{e}_a+\mathbf{e}_v))}{1-\mathbf{p}_{av}(\mathbf{d}-(j+1)(\mathbf{e}_a+\mathbf{e}_v))}.$$

Note that Σ^{k_0} in Lemma 3.2 is just $\Sigma^{k_0}(P,\mathbf{d},a,v,b)$. Furthermore, note that we allow $a=b$ in $\mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d})$ for convenience; its value is irrelevant since $\mathbf{p}_{ava}(\mathbf{d})$ is only called in $\mathcal{R}(a,a,\mathbf{d})$ (see (5.4) below) which is then trivially 1. Of course, the functional value of such an operator is undefined where any denominators are zero. The parameter k_0 is suppressed from the notation Σ, and things involving it, for convenience. We define another associated function $\mathrm{bad} = \mathrm{bad}(\mathbf{p})$ as follows. For $\mathbf{d} \in \Omega$ and $a,b \in [N]$, set

$$\mathrm{bad}(a,b,\mathbf{d}) := \frac{1}{d_a}\left(\sum_{v\in\mathcal{A}(a)\setminus\mathcal{A}(b)}\mathbf{p}_{av}(\mathbf{d}) + \sum_{v\in\mathcal{A}(a)\cap\mathcal{A}(b)}\mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d})\right). \tag{5.2}$$

Given $\mathbf{p} : \vec{\mathcal{A}} \times \Omega \to [0,1]$ and $\mathbf{r} : [N]^2 \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, we define two operators $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r})$ and $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$ as follows. For $\mathbf{d} \in \Omega$ and $a,v,b \in [N]$ with $av \in \mathcal{A}$ we set

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r})(a,v,\mathbf{d}) = d_v\left(\sum_{b\in A(v)}\mathbf{r}(b,a,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_v)\frac{1-\mathbf{p}_{bv}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b-\mathbf{e}_v)}{1-\mathbf{p}_{av}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v)}\right)^{-1}, \tag{5.3}$$

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})(a,b,\mathbf{d}) = \frac{d_a}{d_b}\cdot\frac{1-\mathrm{bad}(a,b,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b)}{1-\mathrm{bad}(b,a,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a)}. \tag{5.4}$$

Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 say essentially (ignoring the issue of truncating the summations at k_0 in (5.1)) that the probability and ratio functions P and R are fixed points of the operators $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{R}$. It is very useful for us that $\mathcal{P}$ is contractive in a neighbourhood of this fixed point. Instead of taking advantage of this directly, from which the presence of k_0 is a deterring factor, we will use following lemma. This gives a quantitative measure of the effect of the attraction near the fixed point.

We denote by $Q_r^0(\mathbf{d})$, $Q_r^1(\mathbf{d}) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^N$ the set of even and odd, respectively, sequences of integers, that have L_1-distance at most r from $\mathbf{d}$. We use $1\pm\xi$ to denote a quantity between $1-\xi$ and $1+\xi$ inclusively.

Lemma 5.1. *Given a constant C, there is a constant $\mu_0 > 0$ such that the following holds. Let N and $\mathcal{A}$ be as above, and let $k_0 > 0$ be an integer and $\mathbf{d} \in \Omega$. Let $0 < \xi \leqslant 1$ and $0 < \mu = \mu(N) < \mu_0$, let $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}' : \vec{\mathcal{A}} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be functions such that $\mathbf{p}_{av}(\mathbf{d}'), \mathbf{p}'_{av}(\mathbf{d}') \leqslant \mu$ for all $av \in \vec{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathbf{d}' \in Q^0_{2k_0+1}(\mathbf{d})$, and let $\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}' : [N]^2 \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$. Assume that $|\mathcal{A}(a) \backslash \mathcal{A}(b)| < Cd_a$ for all a and b such that $\mathcal{A}(a) \cap \mathcal{A}(b) \neq \varnothing$. Let $a, v, b \in [N]$ such that $a \neq b$, $\mathcal{A}(a) \cap \mathcal{A}(b) \neq \varnothing$ and $av \in \mathcal{A}$.*

(a) If $\mathbf{d}$ is odd and $\mathbf{p}_{cw}(\mathbf{d}') = \mathbf{p}'_{cw}(\mathbf{d}')(1 \pm \xi)$ for all $cw \in \mathcal{A}$ and all $\mathbf{d}' \in Q^0_{2k_0+1}(\mathbf{d})$ then

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})(a, b; \mathbf{d}) = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}')(a, b; \mathbf{d})(1 + O(\mu\xi)).$$

(b) If $\mathbf{d}$ is even, $\mathbf{p}_{cw}(\mathbf{d}') = \mathbf{p}'_{cw}(\mathbf{d}')(1 \pm \xi)$ for all $cw \in \mathcal{A}$ and all $\mathbf{d}' \in Q^0_2(\mathbf{d})$, and $\mathbf{r}_{cd}(\mathbf{d}') = \mathbf{r}'_{cd}(\mathbf{d}')(1 \pm \mu\xi)$ for all $c, d \in [N]$ and all $\mathbf{d}' \in Q^1_1(\mathbf{d})$, then

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{r})_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{r}')_{av}(\mathbf{d}) \left(1 + O(\mu\xi)\right).$$

The constants implicit in $O(\cdot)$ are absolute.

Proof. We assume without loss of generality that $\mu_0 < 1/2$ which readily implies that $\mathbf{p}_{av}(\mathbf{d}'), \mathbf{p}'_{av}(\mathbf{d}') < 1/2$ for all $\mathbf{d}' \in Q^0_{2k_0+1}(\mathbf{d})$ and all $a \neq v \in [n]$. For (a) we use $\mathbf{p}_{cw}(\mathbf{d}') = \mathbf{p}'_{cw}(\mathbf{d}')(1 \pm \xi)$ for all $cw \in \mathcal{A}$ and all $\mathbf{d}' \in Q^0_{2k_0+1}(\mathbf{d})$. Apply this to the right hand side of (5.1) and note that in the summation over k, the terms are bounded in size by a geometric series with ratio $O(\mu)$, which can be assumed to be arbitrarily small. This implies, for all $bv \in \mathcal{A}$ and for all $\mathbf{d}' \in Q^0_1(\mathbf{d})$, that $\mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d}') = \mathbf{p}'_{avb}(\mathbf{d}')\big(1+O(\xi)\big)$, and then from (5.2) that $\mathrm{bad}(a, b, \mathbf{d}')(\mathbf{p}) = \mathrm{bad}(a, b, \mathbf{d}')(\mathbf{p}')\big(1+O(\xi)\big)$ for all such $\mathbf{d}'$. Additionally, we observe that $\mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d}') = \mathbf{p}_{av}(\mathbf{d}')O(\mu)$ and hence

$$\mathrm{bad}(a, b, \mathbf{d}') = \left(|\mathcal{A}(a) \backslash \mathcal{A}(b)| + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{A}(a) \cap \mathcal{A}(b)} \mathbf{p}_{av}(\mathbf{d}') \right) O(\mu)/d_a = O(\mu)$$

since $\sum_v \mathbf{p}_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = d_a$ and $|\mathcal{A}(a) \backslash \mathcal{A}(b)| / d_a \leqslant C$ by assumption on $\{a, b\}$. Thus $\mathrm{bad}(a, b, \mathbf{d}')(\mathbf{p}) = \mathrm{bad}(a, b, \mathbf{d}')(\mathbf{p}') + O(\xi\mu)$ for all $\mathbf{d}' \in Q^0_1(\mathbf{d})$. Hence, with μ sufficiently small to ensure $\mathrm{bad}(b, a, \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a) < 1/2$ say, the equation

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})(a, b; \mathbf{d}) = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}')(a, b; \mathbf{d})(1 + O(\mu\xi))$$

follows from (5.4). The equation for $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{r})$ follows immediately from (5.3) since both $\mathbf{p}_{bv}$ and $\mathbf{p}_{av}$ are $O(\mu)$. ∎

6 Approximating the operator fixed points — graph case

In this section, we present functions π and ρ that approximate the probability and ratio functions P and R sufficiently well in the graph case. Rather than showing directly that the proposed functions approximate the fixed points of the operators, we argue by applying the operators successively that the proposed functions approximate the correct functions to ever-increasing accuracy, up to a point. Most of the analysis is the same in the other two cases of our interest, i.e. for digraphs without loops, and bipartite graphs. Those are treated in Section 8.

Let n be an integer, let $\mathbf{d}$ be a sequence of length n and of average degree $d = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{a \in [n]} d_a$, and let $\mu = d/(n-1)$ be the edge density of a graph G that has degree sequence $\mathbf{d}$. With $\mathbf{d}$ we associate a sequence $(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n)$ of the relative deviations from the average degree, that is $\epsilon_a := (d_a - d)/d$. For

the present context, we will be able to assume that ϵ_a is "small". We define $\sigma^p = \sigma^p(\mathbf{d}) = \frac{\mu}{n}\sum_{a=1}^n \epsilon_a^2$. Set

$$P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = \pi(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_v, \mu) := \mu(1+\epsilon_a)(1+\epsilon_v)\cdot\left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_a\epsilon_v\mu}{1-\mu}\right),$$
$$R^{\mathrm{gr}}(a,b;\mathbf{d}) = \rho(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_b, \mu, \sigma^p) := \frac{1+\epsilon_a}{1+\epsilon_b}\cdot\frac{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_b)}{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_a)}\cdot(1+(\epsilon_a-\epsilon_b)\sigma^p).$$

The next lemma contains the key technical evaluations required to implement our approach. It suggests that the "guesses" P^{gr} and R^{gr} given above are very close to the fixed points of the operator $\mathcal{P}$ and its composition with $\mathcal{R}$, and hence close to the actual probability and ratio functions P and R.

Lemma 6.1. *Let n be an integer, $k_0 \leqslant n$, and let $\mathcal{A} = \binom{[n]}{2}$. Let $\mathbf{d}$ be a sequence of length n, and let $a, v, b \in V = [n]$ such that $a \neq v$. Let d and μ be the average degree and edge density defined as above and assume that $\mu < 1/2$ and that $k_0/d \to 0$. Assume that for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$ we have $\epsilon_i = (d_i - d)/d \leqslant \epsilon$, where $\epsilon = \epsilon(n)$ is sufficiently small, and assume that $\sigma^p = \sigma^p(\mathbf{d}) = O(1/n)$. Then*

(a) $\mathcal{R}(P^{\mathrm{gr}})(a,b,\mathbf{d}) = R^{\mathrm{gr}}(a,b,\mathbf{d})\,(1+O(\eta_1))$,

(b) $\mathcal{P}(P^{\mathrm{gr}}, R^{\mathrm{gr}})_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{av}(\mathbf{d})\,(1+O(\eta_2))$,

where $\eta_1 = 1/\mu n^2 + \epsilon\mu/n + \epsilon^4\mu^2 + \mu^{k_0}$ and $\eta_2 = \epsilon/n + \epsilon^3\mu^2$.

Proof of Lemma 6.1. In $\mathcal{R}(P^{\mathrm{gr}})(a,b,\mathbf{d})$ (see (5.4)) we have to estimate the expression $\mathrm{bad}(a,b,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b)$ (and $\mathrm{bad}(b,a,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a)$ respectively) for which, in turn, we need to estimate $\sum \mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b)$, where the sum is over all $v \in [n]$ such that both av and bv are allowable (see (5.2)), and $\mathbf{p}$ in $\mathbf{p}_{avb}$ (see (5.1)) denotes P^{gr}. Set $\mathbf{d}' = \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_b$. By definition (5.1),

$$\mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d}') = \frac{P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{av}(\mathbf{d}')\cdot P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{bv}(\mathbf{d}'-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v)}{1-P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{av}(\mathbf{d}'-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v)} \times\left(\sum_{k=1}^{k_0}(-1)^{k-1}\frac{P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{bv}(\mathbf{d}'-k(\mathbf{e}_a+\mathbf{e}_v))}{P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{bv}(\mathbf{d}'-\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v)}\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}\frac{P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{av}(\mathbf{d}'-j(\mathbf{e}_a+\mathbf{e}_v))}{1-P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{av}(\mathbf{d}'-(j+1)(\mathbf{e}_a+\mathbf{e}_v))}\right). \tag{6.1}$$

For $1 \leqslant j \leqslant k_0+1$ consider the sequence $\mathbf{d}' - j(\mathbf{e}_a+\mathbf{e}_v)$. For this sequence, μ becomes $\mu' = \mu + O(j/n^2)$ since d changes by $O(j/n)$. Therefore, the variables ϵ_a, ϵ_v, and ϵ_b change to $\epsilon'_a = \epsilon_a - j/d + O(j/\mu n^2)$, $\epsilon'_v = \epsilon_v - j/d + O(j/\mu n^2)$, and $\epsilon'_b = \epsilon_b - 1/d + O(j/\mu n^2)$, respectively. (Note that this takes into account that ϵ'_a, ϵ'_v and ϵ'_b are defined with respect to the average degree of $\mathbf{d}' - j(\mathbf{e}_a+\mathbf{e}_v)$.) Hence,

$$P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{av}(\mathbf{d}'-j(\mathbf{e}_a+\mathbf{e}_v)) = \pi(\epsilon'_a,\epsilon'_v,\mu') = \pi(\epsilon_a - j/d, \epsilon_v - j/d, \mu)(1+O(j/\mu n^2), \tag{6.2}$$

and similarly for $P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{bv}(\mathbf{d}'-j(\mathbf{e}_a+\mathbf{e}_v))$. It follows that, with $\delta = 1/d$,

$$\mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d}') = \frac{\pi(\epsilon_a,\epsilon_v,\mu)\cdot\pi(\epsilon_b-\delta,\epsilon_v-\delta,\mu)}{1-\pi(\epsilon_a-\delta,\epsilon_v-\delta,\mu)}\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{\mu n^2}\right)\right) \times\left(\sum_{k=1}^{k_0}(-1)^{k-1}\frac{\pi(\epsilon_b-\delta,\epsilon_v-k\delta,\mu)}{\pi(\epsilon_b-\delta,\epsilon_v-\delta,\mu)}\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}\frac{\pi(\epsilon_a-j\delta,\epsilon_v-j\delta,\mu)}{1-\pi(\epsilon_a-(j+1)\delta,\epsilon_v-(j+1)\delta,\mu)}\right), \tag{6.3}$$

since all the $\pi(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)$ expressions are asymptotically at most $\mu+\epsilon < 1/2$ (for ϵ small). For $0 \leqslant j \leqslant k_0$, set

$$A_j = \frac{\pi(\epsilon_b - \delta, \epsilon_v - (j+1)\delta, \mu)}{\pi(\epsilon_b - \delta, \epsilon_v - j\delta, \mu)}, \qquad B_j = -\frac{\pi(\epsilon_a - j\delta, \epsilon_v - j\delta, \mu)}{1 - \pi(\epsilon_a - (j+1)\delta, \epsilon_v - (j+1)\delta, \mu)},$$

so that

$$\mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d}') = \frac{\pi(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_v, \mu) \cdot \pi(\epsilon_b - \delta, \epsilon_v - \delta, \mu)}{1 - \pi(\epsilon_a - \delta, \epsilon_v - \delta, \mu)} \left(1 + \sum_{k=2}^{k_0} \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} A_j B_j\right) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu n^2}\right)\right). \tag{6.4}$$

It is straightforward from the definition of π to check that $A_j = A_0 + O\left(j\delta^2\right)$, using $j\delta \leqslant k_0\delta \to 0$ and ϵ being small enough. Similarly, $B_j = B_0\left(1 + \widehat{c_1} j + O\left(j^2\delta^2\right)\right)$ where $\widehat{c_1} = -\frac{2\delta}{(1-\mu)} + O\left(\epsilon\delta\right)$. Set $\widehat{c_0} = A_0 B_0 \sim \mu$. By simple expansion we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \prod_{j=1}^{k} A_j B_j &= \sum_{k=0}^{k_0} \widehat{c_0}^{\,k} + \sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \binom{k}{2} \widehat{c_1}\widehat{c_0}^{\,k} + O\left(\sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \mu^k k^2 \delta^2\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\widehat{c_0}} + \frac{\widehat{c_0}\widehat{c_1}}{(1-\widehat{c_0})^3} + O\left(\mu\delta^2 + \mu^{k_0}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

Simple calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1-\widehat{c_0}} &= \frac{1 - \pi(\epsilon_a - \delta, \epsilon_v - \delta, \mu)}{1 - \pi(\epsilon_a - \delta, \epsilon_v - \delta, \mu) + \pi(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_v, \mu) A_0} \\ &= \frac{1 - \pi(\epsilon_a - \delta, \epsilon_v - \delta, \mu)}{1 + \mu\delta + O\left(\mu\delta(\epsilon + \delta)\right)}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

and

$$\frac{\widehat{c_0}\widehat{c_1}}{(1-\widehat{c_0})^2} = 2\mu\delta + O\left(\mu\delta(\epsilon+\delta)\right). \tag{6.7}$$

Combining (6.4), (6.5), (6.6), and (6.7), we obtain

$$\mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d}') = \pi(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_v, \mu) \cdot \pi(\epsilon_b - \delta, \epsilon_v - \delta, \mu)\left(1 + \mu\delta + O\left(\xi\right)\right), \tag{6.8}$$

where $\xi = \mu^{k_0} + \delta^2 + \mu\epsilon\delta$. Since $A(a) \cap A(b) = [n] \backslash \{a, b\}$, this gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{d_a} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{A}(a) \cap \mathcal{A}(b)} \mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d}') \\ &\quad = \frac{1}{d_a} \sum_{\substack{1 \leqslant v \leqslant n \\ v \neq a,b}} \pi(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_v, \mu) \cdot \pi(\epsilon_b - \delta, \epsilon_v - \delta, \mu)\left(1 + \mu\delta + O\left(\xi\right)\right) \\ &\quad = \frac{\mu\left(1 + \epsilon_b - \delta\right)}{n-1}\left(1 + \mu\delta + O\left(\xi\right)\right) \sum_{\substack{1 \leqslant v \leqslant n \\ v \neq a,b}} \left(1 + \epsilon_v\right)\left(1 + \epsilon_v - \delta\right)\left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_a \epsilon_v \mu}{1-\mu}\right)^2 \\ &\quad = \frac{\mu\left(1 + \epsilon_b - \delta\right)}{n-1}\left(1 + \mu\delta + O\left(\xi\right)\right) \sum_{\substack{1 \leqslant v \leqslant n \\ v \neq a,b}} \left(1 - \delta + c_1\epsilon_v + (1 + O(\epsilon\mu))\epsilon_v^2 + O(\epsilon^4\mu)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

where $c_1 = c_1(\delta, \epsilon_a, \mu)$ is some suitable function independent of ϵ_v that satisfies $c_1 = O(1)$. Note that $\sum_{v=1}^n \epsilon_v = \sum_{v=1}^n (d - d_v)/d = 0$ and $\sum_{v=1}^n \epsilon_v^2 = \sigma^p \frac{n}{\mu}$, by definition of σ^p. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1 + \mu\delta + O(\xi)) \sum_{\substack{1 \leqslant v \leqslant n \\ v \neq a,b}} \left(1 - \delta + c_1\epsilon_v + (1 + O(\epsilon\mu))\epsilon_v^2 + O(\epsilon^4\mu)\right) \\
&\quad = (1 + \mu\delta)\left((n-2)(1-\delta) - c_1(\epsilon_a + \epsilon_b) + (1 + O(\epsilon\mu))\left(\frac{n\sigma^p}{\mu} - \epsilon_a^2 - \epsilon_b^2\right)\right) + O(n\epsilon^4\mu + n\xi).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, noting that for (5.2) in this case $A(a)\backslash A(b) = \{b\}$, and recalling that $\mathbf{p}_{ab} = P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{ab}$, we compute similar to (6.2) that

$$\frac{\mathbf{p}_{ab}(\mathbf{d}')}{d_a} = \frac{\pi(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_b - \delta, \mu)}{\mu(n-1)(1+\epsilon_a)}\left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu n^2}\right)\right) = \frac{1+\epsilon_b}{n-1}\left(1 + O\left(\epsilon^2\mu + \frac{1}{\mu n^2}\right)\right).$$

Thus, from (5.2),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{bad}(a, b, \mathbf{d}') &= \frac{1+\epsilon_b}{n-1} + \frac{\mu(1 + \epsilon_b - \delta)}{n-1}(1 + \mu\delta)\left((n-1)(1-\delta) - 1 + \frac{n\sigma^p}{\mu}\right) \\
&\quad + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu n^2} + \frac{\epsilon\mu}{n} + \epsilon^4\mu^2 + \mu^{k_0}\right) \\
&= \mu(1+\epsilon_b) + \sigma^p(1+\epsilon_b) - \frac{1}{n} + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu n^2} + \frac{\epsilon\mu}{n} + \epsilon^4\mu^2 + \mu^{k_0}\right), \qquad (6.10)
\end{aligned}$$

where we use that $\sigma^p = O(1/n)$ and that $\delta = 1/d = 1/(\mu(n-1))$ and note some non-trivial cancellations. The analogous formula is obtained for $\mathrm{bad}(b, a, \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a)$ by swapping indices. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}(P^{\mathrm{gr}})(a, b, \mathbf{d}) &= \frac{d_a}{d_b} \cdot \frac{1 - \mathrm{bad}(a, b, \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e_b})}{1 - \mathrm{bad}(b, a, \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e_a})} \\
&= \frac{1+\epsilon_a}{1+\epsilon_b} \cdot \frac{1 - \mu(1+\epsilon_b)}{1 - \mu(1+\epsilon_a)} \cdot \left(1 + (\epsilon_a - \epsilon_b)\sigma^p + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu n^2} + \frac{\epsilon\mu}{n} + \epsilon^4\mu^2 + \mu^{k_0}\right)\right) \\
&= R^{\mathrm{gr}}(a, b, \mathbf{d}) + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu n^2} + \frac{\epsilon\mu}{n} + \epsilon^4\mu^2 + \mu^{k_0}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves part (a) of the lemma.

To prove part (b) note that, analogous to (6.2), if $\mathbf{d}'$ is the sequence $\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_v$ we also have

$$R^{\mathrm{gr}}(a, b, \mathbf{d}') = \rho(\epsilon_a', \epsilon_b', \mu', \sigma^{p\prime}) = \rho(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_b, \mu, \sigma^p)\left(1 + O\left(1/\mu n^2\right)\right).$$

Therefore, by definition (5.3),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}(P^{\mathrm{gr}}, R^{\mathrm{gr}})_{av}(\mathbf{d}) &= d_v \left(\sum_{b \in [n]\backslash\{v\}} R^{\mathrm{gr}}(b, a, \mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_v)\frac{1 - P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{bv}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_b - \mathbf{e}_v)}{1 - P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{av}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v)}\right)^{-1} \\
&= d_v \left(\sum_{b \in [n]\backslash\{v\}} \rho(\epsilon_b, \epsilon_a, \mu, \sigma^p)\frac{1 - \pi(\epsilon_b - \delta, \epsilon_v - \delta, \mu)}{1 - \pi(\epsilon_a - \delta, \epsilon_v - \delta, \mu)}\left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu n^2}\right)\right)\right)^{-1} \\
&= d_v(1+\epsilon_a)\frac{1 - \pi(\epsilon_a - \delta, \epsilon_v - \delta, \mu)}{1 - \mu(1+\epsilon_a)}\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\epsilon}{n} + \frac{1}{\mu n^2}\right)\right) \\
&\quad \times \left(\sum_{b \in [n]\backslash\{v\}} (1+\epsilon_b)\frac{1 - \pi(\epsilon_b - \delta, \epsilon_v - \delta, \mu)}{1 - \mu(1+\epsilon_b)}\right)^{-1}, \qquad (6.11)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\sigma^p = O(1/n)$ and $\pi(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot) = O(\mu)$. Straightforward calculations show that for $c \in \{a,b\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1-\pi\left(\epsilon_c-\delta,\epsilon_v-\delta,\mu\right)}{1-\mu\left(1+\epsilon_c\right)} &= 1+\frac{\mu}{1-\mu}\left(2\delta-\epsilon_v-\epsilon_v\epsilon_c\right)+O\left(\frac{\epsilon}{n}+\epsilon^3\mu^2+\mu\delta^2\right)\\ &= \left(1-\frac{\mu\epsilon_v\epsilon_c}{1-\mu}\right)\left(1-\frac{\mu(\epsilon_v-2\delta)}{1-\mu}+O\left(\frac{\epsilon}{n}+\epsilon^3\mu^2+\mu\delta^2\right)\right). \qquad (6.12)\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mu\delta^2 = O(1/\mu n^2)$. Therefore, (6.11) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}(P^{\mathrm{gr}},R^{\mathrm{gr}})_{av}(\mathbf{d}) &= d_v(1+\epsilon_a)\left(1-\frac{\epsilon_a\epsilon_v\mu}{1-\mu}\right)\left(1+O\left(\frac{\epsilon}{n}+\frac{1}{\mu n^2}+\epsilon^3\mu^2\right)\right)\sum_{\substack{1\leqslant b\leqslant n\\ b\neq v}}(1+\epsilon_b)\left(1-\frac{\epsilon_b\epsilon_v\mu}{1-\mu}\right)\\ &= \mu(1+\epsilon_v)(1+\epsilon_a)\left(1-\frac{\epsilon_a\epsilon_v\mu}{1-\mu}\right)\left(1+O\left(\frac{\epsilon}{n}+\frac{1}{\mu n^2}+\epsilon^3\mu^2\right)\right)\\ &= \pi(\epsilon_a,\epsilon_v,\mu)\left(1+O\left(\frac{\epsilon}{n}+\frac{1}{\mu n^2}+\epsilon^3\mu^2\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we use that $\sum_b \epsilon_b = 0$ and $\sum_b \epsilon_b^2 = O\left(\frac{1}{\mu}\right)$. ∎

7 Completing the graph case

In [17, Theorem 3.4] it was essentially shown that, when $\mathbf{d}$ has independent binomial entries, then $\sigma(\mathbf{d}) = \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - d)^2$ is concentrated. We give a more efficient proof of this, which also applies to the degree sequence of $\mathcal{G}(n,m)$ which we require as well, using the following result, which seems hard to find explicitly in the published literature.

Lemma 7.1. *Let f be a function defined on the set of subsets of some set U such that $|f(S) - f(T)| \leqslant c$ whenever $|S| = |T| = m$ and $|S \cap T| = m-1$. Let S be a randomly chosen m-subset of U. Then for all $\alpha > 0$ we have*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(|f(S) - \mathbf{E}f(S)| \geqslant \alpha c\sqrt{m}\right) \leqslant 2\exp(-\alpha^2/2).$$

Proof. Consider a process in which the random subset S is generated by inserting m distinct elements one after another, each randomly chosen from the remaining available ones. Let S_k denote the kth subset formed in this process, $0 \leqslant k \leqslant m$. Consider the Doob martingale process determined by $Y_k = \mathbf{E}\big(f(S_m) \mid S_0,\ldots,S_k\big) = \mathbf{E}\left(f(S_m) \mid S_k\right)$. Given S_{k-1}, let $\mathbf{X} = X_k,\ldots,X_m$ denote the remaining elements added in the process. Let $\mathbf{X}_0$ be the random sequence $\mathbf{X}$ conditioned on $X_k = x_k \in U$, and $\mathbf{X}_1$ the random sequence $\mathbf{X}$ conditioned on $X_k = x_k' \in U$. Then $\mathbf{X}_0$ can be coupled with $\mathbf{X}_1$ by interchanging x_k and x_k' wherever they occur in $\mathbf{X}_0$. The values of $f(S_m)$ in the two elements of a couple pair differ by at most c by assumption. Since each possibile realisation of $X_k,\ldots,X_m$ has the same probability, it follows that

$$\left|\mathbf{E}\left(f(S_m) \mid S_{k-1} \wedge X_k = x_k\right) - \mathbf{E}\left(f(S_m) \mid S_{k-1} \wedge X_k = x_k'\right)\right| \leqslant c,$$

and hence $|Y_{k-1} - Y_k| \leqslant c$. Azuma's Inequality (see, e.g., [11]) now completes the proof. ∎

Lemma 7.2. *Define $\mathbf{d} = (d_1,\ldots,d_n)$ either as (a) the degree sequence of a random graph in $\mathcal{G}(n,m)$, or as (b) in $\mathcal{B}_m$, which is a sequence of n i.i.d. random variables each distributed as $\mathrm{Bin}(n-1,p)$ conditioned on $\sum d_i = 2m$ where $m \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\binom{n}{2}$ is integer. Let $d = 2m/n$ and $\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - d)^2$. Then for all $\alpha > 0$ and $0 < \epsilon < 1$,*

(i) provided that $\alpha \leqslant 3\sqrt{d}/2$, *we have* $\mathbf{P}(|d_i - d| > \alpha d^{1/2}) = \exp(-\alpha^2/3)$ *for* $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$;

(ii) provided that $\log n = o(d^\epsilon)$ *we have*

$$\mathbf{P}(|\sigma - d(n-d)| \geqslant \alpha dn + 1) \leqslant 2\exp(-\alpha^2 n d^{-\epsilon}/64) + O(n)\exp(-d^\epsilon/3).$$

Proof. We deal with the graph case (a) first. Each vertex degree d_i is distributed hypergeometrically with expected value d, and hence

$$\mathbf{P}(|d_i - d| > \alpha d^{1/2}) < 2\exp(-\alpha^2/3)$$

by [11, Theorem 2.10 and Corollary 2.3] for example. Part (i) follows for the graph case (a).

For a graph G with degrees $d_1, \dots, d_n$ define

$$f_\epsilon(G) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \min\{(d_i - d)^2, d^{1+\epsilon}\}.$$

Then increasing or decreasing the value of a single d_j by 1 can only change f by at most $(\sqrt{d^{1+\epsilon}})^2 - (\sqrt{d^{1+\epsilon}} - 1)^2 < 2d^{1/2+\epsilon/2}$. Since G is determined by a random m-subset of all possible edges, Lemma 7.1 applies with $c = 8d^{1/2+\epsilon/2}$ (as each edge affects two vertex degrees). Replacing α appropriately gives

$$\mathbf{P}(|f_\epsilon(G) - \mathbf{E}f_\epsilon(G)| \geqslant \alpha dn) \leqslant 2\exp(-\alpha^2 n d^{-\epsilon}/64).$$

On the other hand, letting A denote the event $\max_i |d_i - d| > d^{1/2+\epsilon/2}$ and with the union bound covering all n possible vertices i, (i) implies $\mathbf{P}(A) = O(n)\exp(-d^\epsilon/3)$. Provided that A does not hold, we have $f_\epsilon(G) = \sigma$. Thus

$$\mathbf{P}(|\sigma - \mathbf{E}f_\epsilon(G)| \geqslant \alpha dn) \leqslant 2\exp(-\alpha^2 n d^{-\epsilon}/64) + O(n^2)\exp(-d^\epsilon/3).$$

Additionally, in view of (i),

$$\mathbf{E}\big(\min\{(d_i - d)^2, d^{1+\epsilon}\} - (d_i - d)^2\big) = O(n^2)\mathbf{P}(|d_i - d| > d^{1/2+\epsilon/2}) = O(n^3)\exp(-d^\epsilon/3)$$

and thus, summing over i, we get $|\mathbf{E}\, f_\epsilon(G) - \mathbf{E}\,\sigma| = O(n^4)\exp(-d^\epsilon/3)$. For large n this is at most $1/4$ say, because $\log n = o(d^\epsilon)$ by assumption. Thus

$$\mathbf{P}(|\sigma - \mathbf{E}\sigma| \geqslant \alpha dn + 1/4)) \leqslant 2\exp(-\alpha^2 n d^{-\epsilon}/64) + O(n^2)\exp(-d^\epsilon/3).$$

To evaluate $\mathbf{E}\sigma$ we note that $\mathbf{E}(d_i - d)^2 = \mathbf{Var}\, d_i = p(n-1)(1-p) = d(1-p)$ and so $\mathbf{E}\sigma = nd(1-p) = d(n - nd/(n-1)) = d(n-d) + \xi$, where $|\xi| \leqslant 1/4$ as $d \leqslant n/2$. Part (ii) follows for (a).

The proof of (iii) is similar to, and easier than, (ii), since we may argue directly with the function $f(G) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |d_i - d|$. In this case we may apply Lemma 7.1 with $c = 2$ and $\alpha = n\sqrt{d}/2\sqrt{m} = \sqrt{n/2}$ to obtain

$$\mathbf{P}\left(|f(G) - \mathbf{E}f(G)| \geqslant n\sqrt{d}\right) \leqslant 2\exp(-n/2).$$

Essentially the same argument applies, to (i) and (ii), for the binomial case (b), by regarding $d_1, \dots, d_n$ each as a sum of $n-1$ independent indicator variables. Conditioning on the sum being $2m$ is equivalent to a uniformly random selection of a $2m$-subset of the $n(n-1)$ indicator variables. ∎

Lemma 7.3. *Let* n *be an integer, let* $k_0 = 4\log n$ *and let* d *be such that* dn *is an integer. Assume that* $\mu = d/(n-1)$ *satisfies* $100(\log n)^2/n < \mu < \mu_0$ *for some small enough constant* μ_0. *Let* $\mathcal{D}$ *be a set of non-negative integer sequences* $\mathbf{d}$ *satisfying the following:*

(i) $d = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i$,

(ii) $|d_i - d| = O(\sqrt{d \log n})$ *for all* $i \in [n]$,

(iii) $\sum_{i=1}^{n}(d_i - d)^2 = O(dn)$.

If dn *is even then for all* $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}$ *and* $a \neq v \in [n]$

$$P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{av}(\mathbf{d})\big(1 + O(\eta_1 + \eta_2 + (2\mu)^{k_0})\big) \tag{7.1}$$

and if dn *is odd then for all* $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}$ *and* $a \neq b \in [n]$

$$R(a, b, \mathbf{d}) = R^{\mathrm{gr}}(a, b, \mathbf{d})\big(1 + O(\eta_1 + \mu\eta_2 + (2\mu)^{k_0})\big), \tag{7.2}$$

where η_1 *and* η_2 *are the error terms from Lemma* 6.1*(a) and (b) with* ϵ *being* $O(\sqrt{(\log n)/d})$.

We remark that the formula for P in (7.1) is needed to obtain (7.2), but it is not needed for the remainder of the argument. We decided to include it in the statement of the lemma for the curious reader.

Proof of Lemma 7.3. For an integer $r \geqslant 0$, denote by $Q^0_r(\mathcal{D})$ (or $Q^1_r(\mathcal{D})$) the set of all even (or odd, respectively) sequences $\mathbf{d}$ with all entries non-negative that are at L_1 distance at most r from a sequence in $\mathcal{D}$. Note that the lower bound on μ and condition (ii) imply that $d_i > 0$ for all $\mathbf{d} \in Q^0_r(\mathcal{D}) \cup Q^1_r(\mathcal{D})$ whenever $r \leqslant 99(\log n)^2$ and n is sufficiently large. For the remainder of the proof set $r = 2k_0 + 2$.

One can easily check that for $\mathbf{d} \in Q^0_{r(r+5)+2}(\mathcal{D})$ the conditions of Lemma 2.4(a) are satisfied. Hence, all such $\mathbf{d}$ are realisable, and $R(a, b, \mathbf{d})$ is defined for all $\mathbf{d} \in Q^1_{r(r+5)+1}(\mathbf{d})$.

The reason for choosing $r(r + 5) + 1$ is that, starting with an intial approximation for P and R, we use Lemma 5.1 several times, improving the relative error of the approximation by a factor of μ in each iteration. In each step, the radius of sequences for which we can prove the improved approximation using Lemma 5.1 shrinks by r.

First note that $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d}) > 0$ for all $\mathbf{d} \in Q^0_{r(r+5)+2}(\mathcal{D})$ by Lemma 2.4(a). After this, Lemma 2.3, together with conditions (i) and (ii), implies

$$P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) \leqslant \frac{\mu}{1-\mu}(1 + o(1)) < \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{d} \in Q^0_{r(r+5)+2}(\mathcal{D}), \tag{7.3}$$

for n sufficiently large and $\mu_0 < 1/4$. Next consider any distinct $a, v, b \in [n]$ and $\mathbf{d} \in Q^0_{r(r+5)}(\mathcal{D})$. Then $\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v \in Q^0_{r(r+5)+2}$ and hence $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v) > 0$ from above, and $P_{av}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v) < 1$ for n sufficiently large. Thus $\mathcal{N}_{av}(\mathbf{d}) > 0$ by Lemma 2.2, and we have $\mathcal{N}_{av}(\mathbf{d}) < \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{d})$ since $P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) < 1$ by (7.3).

Now (7.3) applies to all the P_{av} and P_{bv} appearing in the definition of $\Sigma^{k_0} = \Sigma^{k_0}(P, \mathbf{d}, a, v, b)$ for all $\mathbf{d} \in Q^0_{r(r+4)}(\mathcal{D})$, so the alternating bounds in Lemma 3.2 imply that

$$P_{avb}(\mathbf{d}) = \frac{P_{av}(\mathbf{d})\Sigma^{k_0}(P)}{(1 - P_{av}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a - \mathbf{e}_v)}(1 + O((2\mu)^{k_0})) = (\mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d}))(P)(1 + O((2\mu)^{k_0})),$$

as per definition (5.1). Hence, Proposition 3.1(b) implies (c.f. (5.4)) that

$$R(a, b, \mathbf{d}) = \mathcal{R}(P)(a, b, \mathbf{d})\big(1 + O((2\mu)^{k_0})\big) \tag{7.4}$$

for all $\mathbf{d} \in Q^1_{r(r+4)-1}(\mathcal{D})$. We now claim that for $\xi \leqslant 1$, if

$$P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{av}(\mathbf{d})(1 \pm \xi) \tag{7.5}$$

for all $a \neq v \in [n]$ and $\mathbf{d} \in Q^0_{r\ell}(\mathcal{D})$ $(1 \leqslant \ell \leqslant r+1)$ then

$$P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{av}(\mathbf{d})\big(1 + O(\mu\xi + \eta_1 + \eta_2 + (2\mu)^{k_0})\big) \tag{7.6}$$

for all such a, v and $\mathbf{d} \in Q^0_{r(\ell-1)}(\mathcal{D})$.

Define the compositional operator $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{p}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{p}, \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}))$. By Lemma 5.1(a) $\mathcal{R}(P)(a,b,\mathbf{d}) = \mathcal{R}(P^{\mathrm{gr}})(a,b,\mathbf{d})\,(1 + O\,(\mu\xi))$ for all $\mathbf{d} \in Q^1_{r(\ell-1)+1}(\mathcal{D})$, $a, b \in [n]$. Applying Lemma 5.1(b) now with $\mathbf{r} = \mathcal{R}(P)$, $\mathbf{r}' = \mathcal{R}(P^{\mathrm{gr}})$ (and ξ replaced by $C\xi$ for a suitable large constant C) gives

$$\mathcal{C}(P)_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = \mathcal{C}(P^{\mathrm{gr}})_{av}(\mathbf{d})\big(1 + O(\mu\xi)\big)$$

for $\mathbf{d} \in Q^0_{r(\ell-1)}(\mathcal{D})$, $(a, v) \in [n]^2$ (note that $\mathcal{C}$ is not necessarily symmetric in a, v). The right hand side of this is estimated using Lemma 6.1, the two parts one after another, to get first $\mathcal{R}$ and then combining with Lemma 5.1(b) to get $\mathcal{P}$, giving $P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{av}(\mathbf{d})(1 + O(\eta_2 + \mu\eta_1 + \mu\xi))$. The left hand side is analysed by combining (7.4) with Lemma 5.1(b). We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}(P)_{av}(\mathbf{d}) &= \mathcal{P}\left(P, \mathcal{R}(P)\right)_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = \mathcal{P}\left(P, R\right)_{av}(\mathbf{d})\left(1 + O\big((2\mu)^{k_0}\big)\right)\\ &= P_{av}(\mathbf{d})\left(1 + O\big((2\mu)^{k_0}\big)\right)\end{aligned}$$

by comparing Proposition 3.1 (for this we need $\mathbf{d}$ to be even) with (5.3). Equating the two sides gives $P_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{av}(\mathbf{d})\big(1 + O(\mu\xi + \mu\eta_1 + \eta_2 + (2\mu)^{k_0})\big)$, as required for (7.6).

Note that the case $\xi = 1$ of (7.5) holds because $P_{av}(\mathbf{d}') \leqslant 1.5\mu$. Since (7.5) implies (7.6) for all $\xi \leqslant 1$, it follows (renaming the error term in (7.6) as ξ, etc.) that (7.6) holds with $\xi = 0$ for $\mathbf{d} \in Q^0_r(\mathcal{D})$, which implies (7.1). Then (7.2) follows from this, Lemma 5.1(a), Lemma 6.1(a) and (7.4). ∎

Theorem 7.4. *Let n be an integer, let d be such that dn is an even integer, and assume that $\mu = d/(n-1)$ satisfies that for all fixed $K > 0$ we have $(\log n)^K/n < \mu = o\big(1/(\log n)^{2/3}\big)$. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the set of degree sequences $\mathbf{d}$ satisfying the following for some constant $C \geqslant 2$:*

(i) $d = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n d_i$,

(ii) $|d_i - d| \leqslant C\sqrt{d \log n}$ *for all* $i \in [n]$,

(iii) $\sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - d)^2 \leqslant Cdn$.

Then (1.3) holds uniformly for all $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D}$.

Proof. We first define two probability spaces, S and S' (both functions of n and μ), for use in Lemma 2.1. For S, define for all even sequences $\mathbf{d}$

$$\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{d}) = Z^{-1}\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{E}_p{}'}(\mathbf{d}) \exp\Big(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{{\gamma_2}^2}{4\mu^2(1-\mu)^2}\Big)$$

where Z is the obvious normalising factor, being the expected value in $\mathcal{E}_p{}'$ of the exponential "weighting" factor. (This is in order ensure that the sum of probabilities in S is 1.) Since $\gamma_2 = \sigma/(n-1)^2$, it follows from Lemma 7.2(ii) that σ is sharply concentrated near $d(n-d)$ and hence

$Z \sim 1$. On the other hand, define S' to be exactly the random degree sequence of $\mathcal{G}(n,m)$ where $m = dn/2$.

Define a graph G with vertex set $\mathcal{D}$, and with an edge joining each two sequences in $\mathcal{D}$ of the form $\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a$ and $\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_b$ for some $a \neq b$ and (odd) $\mathbf{d}$. We have (for example by Jensen's inequality) that $\sum_{i=1}^n |d_i - d|/n \leqslant \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - d)^2/n} = O(\sqrt{d})$ for such $\mathbf{d}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\mathcal{D}$ contains all even sequences satisfying (ii) and (iii) for a specific constant C. With that assumption, it is now easy to see that the diameter of G is $r = O(n\sqrt{d})$. Moreover,

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a)}{\mathbf{P}_S(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_b)} = R^{\mathrm{gr}}(a,b,\mathbf{d}) \left(1 + o\left(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{d}}\right)\right)$$

(c.f. (4.3)) and

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}_{S'}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_a)}{\mathbf{P}_{S'}(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e}_b)} = R(a,b,\mathbf{d}) = R^{\mathrm{gr}}(a,b,\mathbf{d})\big(1 + O(\eta_1 + \mu\eta_2 + (2\mu)^{k_0})\big),$$

by Lemma 7.3, where $\eta_1 = 1/\mu n^2 + \epsilon\mu/n + \epsilon^4\mu^2 + \mu^{k_0} = o(1/n\sqrt{d})$ and $\mu\eta_2 = \epsilon\mu/n + \epsilon^3\mu^3 = o(1/n\sqrt{d})$ since $\epsilon = \max_i(d_i - d)/d = O(\sqrt{(\log n)/d})$, $\mu = d/(n-1) = o(1/\sqrt{\log n})$, and $k_0 = 4\log n$. That is, we have the hypothesis on ratios of probabilities stated in Lemma 2.1 with $\delta = o(1/n\sqrt{d})$.

Considering Lemma 7.2, put $\alpha = C\sqrt{\log n}$ in (i) and $\alpha = 1/2$ in (ii), with arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$. These parts of that lemma show that the probability of the set $\mathcal{D}$ in either of the two models concerned is $1 - O(n^{1-C^2/3}) = 1 - o(1)$ as $C \geqslant 2$. Thus, we may put $\epsilon = o(1)$ in Lemma 2.1, and the result now follows from that lemma. ∎

Utilising the final statements of the previous proof gives the following, which we take the liberty of calling a corollary.

Corollary 7.5. *Conjecture 1.2 is true.*

Proof. The theorem applies uniformly to degree sequences restricted according to (ii) and (iii). It follows that there is a function $C = C(n) \to \infty$ for which the same conclusions hold for the resulting set $\mathcal{D}'$, and in particular the last statement in the proof, which implies that the probability of $\mathcal{D}'$ as the degree sequence of a random graph is $n^{-\omega}$ for some $\omega \to \infty$. ∎

It follows in particular of course that the binomial properties defined in the introduction hold for all p as stated.

Finally, we remark that the result is still interesting even if $o(n^{-\omega(n)})$ in the conjecture were relaxed to $o(1)$. To prove this, it is possible to use a weaker concentration result, employing only variance and Chebyshev's inequality. We leave the details to the reader.

Perhaps surprisingly, our method reaches up to degrees which are a constant times n.

Theorem 7.6. *Let $\alpha < 3/5$. Assume that $d > 100\log^2 n$ and $d < \mu_0 n$ for some sufficiently small constant μ_0, and $\max_j\{d_j - d\} = o(d^\alpha)$. Then formula (1.1) holds uniformly.*

Proof. Exactly the same argument as for the proof of Theorem 7.4 and Corollary 7.5 applies, with further expansions to collect the next significant terms. See Lemma Lemma 9.1 and the preceding discussion for details of the operators. ∎

The Theorems in this section easily cover the gap for which Conjecture 1.1 was previously unverified.

8 Bipartite and digraph cases

In this section we show how to tweak the argument in the Section 6 for it to be applicable to bipartite graphs and digraphs without loops. Let $\delta^{\mathrm{gr}}, \delta^{\mathrm{di}}, \delta^{\mathrm{bip}}$ be indicator variables depending on which case we are in, e.g. $\delta^{\mathrm{gr}} = 1$ if and only if we are in the graph case, etc. For $\epsilon_a, \epsilon_b, \epsilon_v, \mu, \sigma^p \in \mathbb{R}$ we set

$$\pi(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_v, \mu) = \mu(1+\epsilon_a)(1+\epsilon_v) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_a \epsilon_v \mu}{1-\mu}\right).$$

$$\rho(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_b, \mu, \sigma^p) = \frac{1+\epsilon_a}{1+\epsilon_b} \cdot \frac{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_b)}{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_a)} \cdot \left(1 + (\epsilon_a - \epsilon_b)\left(\sigma^p - \frac{\delta^{\mathrm{bip}} + \delta^{\mathrm{di}}}{n}\right) + \frac{\delta^{\mathrm{di}}(\epsilon_{a+n} - \epsilon_{b+n})}{n}\right).$$

Bipartite graph case.
Let n, m be integers and let $\mathbf{d}_A$ and $\mathbf{d}_B$ a sequences of length n and m, respectively, where $\mathbf{d}_A$ has average degree $d_A = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{a=1}^{n}(\mathbf{d}_A)_a$, and $\mathbf{d}_B$ has average degree $d_B = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{v=1}^{m}(\mathbf{d}_B)_v$. For simplicity in presentation, we assume that $n = \Theta(m)$. Assume that $d_A n = d_B m$ and let $\mu = \frac{d_A}{m} = \frac{d_B}{n}$ be the edge density of a bipartite graph G that has degree sequence $\mathbf{d}_A$ on one side and degree sequence $\mathbf{d}_B$ on the other side. With $\mathbf{d} = (\mathbf{d}_A, \mathbf{d}_B)$ we associate a sequence $(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n, \epsilon_{n+1}, \dots, \epsilon_{n+m})$ of the relative deviations from the respective average degrees, i.e. $\epsilon_a = (d_A - d_a)/d_A$ for all $1 \leqslant a \leqslant n$ and $\epsilon_v = (d_B - d_v)/d_B$ for all $n+1 \leqslant v \leqslant n+m$. We define $\sigma^p = \frac{\mu}{m}\sum_{v=n+1}^{n+m}\epsilon_v^2$ and set

$$P^{\mathrm{bip}}_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = \pi(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_v, \mu) = \mu(1+\epsilon_a)(1+\epsilon_v) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_a \epsilon_v \mu}{1-\mu}\right), \text{and}$$

$$R^{\mathrm{bip}}(a, b; \mathbf{d}) = \rho(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_b, \mu, \sigma^p) = \frac{1+\epsilon_a}{1+\epsilon_b} \cdot \frac{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_b)}{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_a)} \cdot \left(1 + (\epsilon_a - \epsilon_b)\left(\sigma^p - \frac{1}{n}\right)\right).$$

Digraph case.
Fix n be an integer and let $\mathbf{d}_{\mathrm{out}}$ and $\mathbf{d}_{\mathrm{in}}$ be sequences of length n, both of average degree $d = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{a=1}^{n}(\mathbf{d}_{\mathrm{out}})_a = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{v=1}^{n}(\mathbf{d}_{\mathrm{in}})_v$. Let $\mu = d/(n-1)$ be the edge density of a digraph G without loops that has out-degree sequence $\mathbf{d}_{\mathrm{out}}$ and in-degree sequence $\mathbf{d}_{\mathrm{in}}$. With $\mathbf{d} = (\mathbf{d}_{\mathrm{out}}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathrm{in}})$ we associate a sequence $(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n, \epsilon_{n+1}, \dots, \epsilon_{2n})$ of the relative deviations of in- and out-degrees from the average degree, i.e. $\epsilon_a = (d - d_a)/d$ for all $1 \leqslant a \leqslant 2n$. We define $\sigma^p = \frac{\mu}{n}\sum_{v=n+1}^{2n}\epsilon_v^2$ and set

$$P^{\mathrm{di}}_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = \pi(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_v, \mu) = \mu(1+\epsilon_a)(1+\epsilon_v) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_a \epsilon_v \mu}{1-\mu}\right), \text{ and}$$

$$R^{\mathrm{di}}(a, b; \mathbf{d}) = \rho(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_b, \mu, \sigma^p) = \frac{1+\epsilon_a}{1+\epsilon_b} \cdot \frac{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_b)}{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_a)} \cdot \left(1 + (\epsilon_a - \epsilon_b)\left(\sigma^p - \frac{1}{n}\right) + \frac{\epsilon_{a+n} - \epsilon_{b+n}}{n}\right).$$

The generalisation of Lemma 6.1, treating the graph case, bipartite graph case and digraph together, is the following.

Lemma 8.1. *Let n, m be integers, $k_0 \leqslant \min\{n, m\}$, and let $N = N(n, m), \mathcal{A}$ be as in one of the three cases, i.e. in the graph case, the bipartite case, or the digraph case. Let $\mathbf{d}$ be a sequence of length N, and let $a, v, b \in V = [N]$. In the graph case, we assume that $a \neq v$, in the bipartite and the digraph case we assume that $a, b \in [n]$ and $v \in [n+1, n+m]$. Let d, d_A, d_B and μ be defined as above in one of the three cases and assume that $\mu < 1/2$ and that k_0/d, $k_0/d_B \to 0$. Let $(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_N)$ be the sequence of relative deviations in any of the three cases described above and assume that for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant N$, $\epsilon_i \leqslant \epsilon$, where ϵ is sufficiently small. Let $P^* \in \{P^{\mathrm{gr}}, P^{\mathrm{bip}}, P^{\mathrm{di}}\}$ and $R^* \in \{R^{\mathrm{gr}}, R^{\mathrm{bip}}, R^{\mathrm{di}}\}$. Assume that $\sigma^p = O(1/N)$. Then*

(a) $\mathcal{R}(P^*)(a, b, \mathbf{d}) = R^*(a, b, \mathbf{d})\,(1 + O(\eta_1))$,

(b) $\mathcal{P}(P^*,R^*)_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = P^*_{av}(\mathbf{d})\left(1+O\left(\eta_2\right)\right),$

where $\eta_1 = \frac{1}{\mu n^2}+\frac{\epsilon\mu}{n}+\epsilon^4\mu^2+\mu^{k_0}$ *and* $\eta_2 = \frac{\epsilon}{n}+\epsilon^3\mu^2$.

Proof of Lemma 8.1. The proof for the graph case is done in Lemma 6.1. We point out the differences to the bipartite graph case and the digraph case here. We concentrate on the bipartite case first. Note that the function $\pi(\epsilon_a,\epsilon_v,\mu)$ is the same as in all three cases. In $\mathbf{p}_{avb}$ we replace $P^{\mathrm{bip}}_{cv}(\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b-j(\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v))$ (for $c\in\{a,b\}$) by $\pi(\cdot,\cdot,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b-j(\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v))$ with the appropriate arguments, see (6.1) and (6.3). For $1\leqslant j\leqslant k_0+1$ and for the degree sequence $\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_b-j(\mathbf{e}_a-\mathbf{e}_v)$, the variable μ changes to $\mu' = \mu+O(j/n^2)$, and therefore the variables ϵ_a, ϵ_v and ϵ_b change to $\epsilon_a - j/d_A + O(j/(\mu n^2)$, $\epsilon_v - j/d_B + O(j/(\mu n^2)$ and $\epsilon_b - 1/d_A + O(j/(\mu n^2)$, respectively. It follows that with $\delta_A = 1/d_A$ and $\delta_B = 1/d_B$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d}') = {}& \frac{\pi(\epsilon_a,\epsilon_v,\mu)\cdot\pi(\epsilon_b-\delta_A,\epsilon_v-\delta_B,\mu)}{1-\pi(\epsilon_a-\delta_A,\epsilon_v-\delta_B,\mu)}\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{\mu n^2}\right)\right)\\ &\times\left(\sum_{k=1}^{k_0}(-1)^k\frac{\pi(\epsilon_b-\delta_A,\epsilon_v-k\delta_B,\mu)}{\pi(\epsilon_b-\delta_A,\epsilon_v-\delta_B,\mu)}\prod_{j=1}^{k}\frac{\pi(\epsilon_a-j\delta_A,\epsilon_v-j\delta_B,\mu)}{1-\pi(\epsilon_a-(j+1)\delta_A,\epsilon_v-(j+1)\delta_B,\mu)}\right).\end{aligned}$$

The rational functions A_j and B_j are then defined accordingly (the δ in the first coordinate of each π is replaced by δ_A, the δ in the second coordinate of each π is replaced by δ_B) and satisfy $A_j = A_0+O(j\delta^2)$ and

$$B_j = B_0(1+\widehat{c_1}j+O(j^2\delta^2)),$$

where $\delta=\max\{\delta_A,\delta_B\}$ and $\widehat{c_1} = -(\delta_A+\delta_B)/(1-\mu)+O(\epsilon\delta)$. If we define $\widehat{c_0} = A_0B_0$ again and follow the calculations that led to (6.6) and (6.7) we see that

$$\frac{1}{1-\widehat{c_0}} = \frac{1-\pi(\epsilon_a-\delta_A,\epsilon_v-\delta_B,\mu)}{1+\mu\delta_A+O(\mu\delta(\epsilon+\delta))},$$

and that

$$\frac{\widehat{c_0}\widehat{c_1}}{(1-\widehat{c_0})^2} = \mu(\delta_A+\delta_B)+O\left(\frac{\epsilon}{n}+\frac{1}{\mu n^2}\right).$$

Combining these identities we get that

$$\mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d}') = \pi(\epsilon_a,\epsilon_v,\mu)\cdot\pi(\epsilon_b-\delta_A,\epsilon_v-\delta_B,\mu)\left(1+\mu\delta_B+O\left(\xi\right)\right),$$

where $\xi=\mu^{k_0}+\delta^2+\mu\epsilon\delta$ again. Now note that $\mathcal{A}(a)=\mathcal{A}(b)=[n+1,n+m]$. Therefore (following the calculation in (6.9) and (6.10)),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{bad}(a,b,\mathbf{d}') &= \frac{1}{d_a}\left(\sum_{v=n+1}^{n+m}\pi(\epsilon_a,\epsilon_v,\mu)\cdot\pi(\epsilon_b-\delta_A,\epsilon_v-\delta_B,\mu)\left(1+\mu\delta_B+O\left(\xi\right)\right)\right)\\ &= \frac{\mu\left(1+\epsilon_b-\delta_A\right)}{m}\left(1+\mu\delta_B+O\left(\xi\right)\right)\\ &\quad\times\sum_{v=n+1}^{n+m}\left(1+\epsilon_v\right)\left(1+\epsilon_v-\delta_B\right)\left(1-\frac{\epsilon_a\epsilon_v\mu}{1-\mu}\right)^2\\ &= \mu\left(1+\epsilon_b\right)+\epsilon_b(\sigma^p-\mu\delta_B)-\mu(\delta_A+\delta_B)+\sigma^p+\mu^2\delta_B\\ &\quad+O\left(\mu^2\epsilon\delta+\frac{\mu\epsilon}{n}+\epsilon^4\mu^2+\mu^{k_0}+\delta^2\mu\right),\end{aligned}\tag{8.1}$$

where we used that $\sum_{v=n+1}^{n+m} \epsilon_v = \sum_{v=n+1}^{n+m} (d_B - d_v)/d_B = 0$ and $\sum_{v=n+1}^{n+m} \epsilon_v^2 = \sigma^p \frac{m}{\mu} = O(1/n)$, by definition of σ^p and assumption. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}(P^{\text{bip}})(a,b,\mathbf{d}) &= \frac{d_a}{d_b} \cdot \frac{1-\text{bad}(a,b,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e_b})}{1-\text{bad}(b,a,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e_a})} \\
&= \frac{1+\epsilon_a}{1+\epsilon_b} \cdot \frac{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_b)}{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_a)} \cdot \left(1 + (\epsilon_a - \epsilon_b)\left(\sigma^p - \mu\delta_B\right) + O\left(\mu^2\epsilon\delta + \frac{\mu\epsilon}{n} + \epsilon^4\mu^2 + \mu^{k_0} + \delta^2\mu\right)\right) \\
&= R^{\text{bip}}(a,b,\mathbf{d}) + O\left(\mu\delta^2 + \frac{\mu\epsilon}{n} + \epsilon^4\mu^2 + \mu^{k_0}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

since $\delta_B = 1/d_B = 1/(\mu n)$.

For part (b), we follow the calculation in (6.11), replacing again δ by δ_A in the first coordinate of occurrences of π, and by δ_B in the second coordinate, to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}(P^{\text{bip}}, R^{\text{bip}})_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = d_v(1+\epsilon_a)\frac{1-\pi\left(\epsilon_a - \delta_A, \epsilon_v - \delta_B, \mu\right)}{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_a)}\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\epsilon}{n} + \frac{1}{\mu n^2}\right)\right) \\
\times \left(\sum_{b \in A(v)} (1+\epsilon_b)\frac{1-\pi\left(\epsilon_b - \delta_A, \epsilon_v - \delta_B, \mu\right)}{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_b)}\right)^{-1}. \qquad (8.2)
\end{aligned}$$

Changing the δ's has the following effect on the calculation in (6.12):

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1-\pi\left(\epsilon_c - \delta_A, \epsilon_v - \delta_B, \mu\right)}{1-\mu\left(1+\epsilon_c\right)} &= 1 + \frac{\mu}{1-\mu}\left(\delta_A + \delta_B - \epsilon_v(1+\epsilon_c)\right) + O\left(\epsilon\mu\delta + \epsilon^3\mu^2\right) \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{\mu\epsilon_v\epsilon_c}{1-\mu}\right)\left(1 + \frac{\mu}{1-\mu}\left(\delta_A + \delta_B - \epsilon_v\right) + O\left(\epsilon\mu\delta + \epsilon^3\mu^2\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This then results in

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}(P^{\text{bip}}, R^{\text{bip}})_{av}(\mathbf{d}) &= d_v(1+\epsilon_a)\left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_a\epsilon_v\mu}{1-\mu}\right)\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\epsilon}{n} + \frac{1}{\mu n^2} + \epsilon^3\mu^2\right)\right)\left(\sum_{1 \leqslant b \leqslant n} (1+\epsilon_b)\left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_b\epsilon_v\mu}{1-\mu}\right)\right)^{-1} \\
&= \mu(1+\epsilon_v)(1+\epsilon_a)\left(1 - \frac{\epsilon_a\epsilon_v\mu}{1-\mu}\right)\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\epsilon}{n} + \frac{1}{\mu n^2} + \epsilon^3\mu^2\right)\right) \\
&= \pi(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_v, \mu)\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\epsilon}{N} + \frac{1}{\mu n^2} + \epsilon^3\mu^2\right)\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we use that $\sum_b \epsilon_b = 0$ and $\sum_b \epsilon_b^2 = O\left(\frac{n}{\mu m}\right)$.

We now turn to the digraph case. Note that the function $\pi(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_v, \mu)$ is the same as in the graph case. The proof is therefore the same as the proof of Lemma 6.1 until (6.8), where we concluded that

$$\mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d}') = \pi(\epsilon_a, \epsilon_v, \mu) \cdot \pi(\epsilon_b - \delta, \epsilon_v - \delta, \mu)\left(1 + \mu\delta + O\left(\mu^{k_0} + \delta^2 + \mu\epsilon\delta\right)\right),$$

where $\delta = 1/d$ just as in the graph case. Since the set of allowable edges A^{di} is slightly different from A^{gr}, the summation in $\text{bad}(a,b,\mathbf{d}')$ changes as follows (applying the same transformations as

in (6.9) and (6.10)):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{bad}(a,b,\mathbf{d}') &= \frac{1}{d_a}\left(\mathbf{p}_{a(n+b)}(\mathbf{d}') + \sum_{\substack{n+1\leqslant v\leqslant 2n\\ v\neq n+a,n+b}} \mathbf{p}_{avb}(\mathbf{d}')\right)\\ &= \frac{1+\epsilon_{(b+n)}}{n-1} + O\left(\frac{\epsilon\mu}{n} + \frac{1}{\mu n^2} + \epsilon^4\mu^2 + \mu^{k_0}\right)\\ &\quad + \frac{\mu\,(1+\epsilon_b-\delta)}{n-1}\,(1+\mu\delta)\left((n-1)(1-\delta) - 1 + \frac{n\sigma^p}{\mu}\right)\\ &= (\mu+\sigma^p)(1+\epsilon_b) + \frac{\epsilon_{(b+n)}-\epsilon_b-1}{n} + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu n^2} + \frac{\epsilon\mu}{n} + \epsilon^4\mu^2 + \mu^{k_0}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where we use $\sum_{v=n+1}^{2n}\epsilon_v = 0$, $\sum_{v=n+1}^{2n}\epsilon_v^2 = \sigma^p n/\mu = O(1/\mu)$, by definition of σ^p, and $\delta = 1/d = 1/(\mu(n-1))$. As in the two cases above, an analogous formula holds for $\mathrm{bad}(b,a,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e}_a)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}(P^{\mathrm{di}})(a,b,\mathbf{d}) &= \frac{d_a}{d_b}\cdot\frac{1-\mathrm{bad}(a,b,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e_b})}{1-\mathrm{bad}(b,a,\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{e_a})}\\ &= \frac{1+\epsilon_a}{1+\epsilon_b}\cdot\frac{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_b)}{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_a)}\\ &\quad\times\left(1+(\epsilon_a-\epsilon_b)\left(\sigma^p-\frac{1}{n}\right)+\frac{\epsilon_{a+n}-\epsilon_{b+n}}{n}+O\left(\frac{1}{\mu n^2}+\frac{\epsilon\mu}{n}+\epsilon^4\mu^2+\mu^{k_0}\right)\right)\\ &= R^{\mathrm{di}}(a,b,\mathbf{d}) + O\left(\frac{1}{\mu n^2}+\frac{\epsilon\mu}{n}+\epsilon^4\mu^2+\mu^{k_0}\right).\end{aligned}$$

For part (b), the calculations in (6.11) and (6.12) are identical to the graph case. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}(P^{\mathrm{di}},R^{\mathrm{di}})_{av}(\mathbf{d}) &= d_v(1+\epsilon_a)\left(1-\frac{\epsilon_a\epsilon_v\mu}{1-\mu}\right)\left(1+O\left(\frac{\epsilon}{n}+\epsilon^3\mu^2\right)\right)\sum_{\substack{1\leqslant b\leqslant n\\ b\neq v-n}}(1+\epsilon_b)\left(1-\frac{\epsilon_b\epsilon_v\mu}{1-\mu}\right)\\ &= \mu(1+\epsilon_v)(1+\epsilon_a)\left(1-\frac{\epsilon_a\epsilon_v\mu}{1-\mu}\right)\left(1+O\left(\frac{\epsilon}{n}+\epsilon^3\mu^2\right)\right)\\ &= \pi(\epsilon_a,\epsilon_v,\mu)\left(1+O\left(\frac{\epsilon}{n}+\epsilon^3\mu^2\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we use that $\sum_b\epsilon_b = 0$ and $\sum_b\epsilon_b^2 = O\left(\frac{1}{\mu}\right)$. ∎

The expected asymptotic formulae, for loopless digraphs, and for bipartite graphs in the case $m = \Theta(n)$, filling the gap between the known cases (sparse and dense), follow from these results using virtually the same argument as in Section 7.

9 The formulae with higher accuracy

We used Maple to extend the expansions occurring earlier in the paper. The formulae for probabilities and ratios for graphs are

$$P^{\mathrm{gr}}_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = \mu(1+\epsilon_a)(1+\epsilon_v)\left(1-\mu\epsilon_a\epsilon_v+(\epsilon_a+\epsilon_v)\left(\frac{1}{n}+\frac{\sigma^p}{1-\mu}\right)\right)$$

$$R^{\mathrm{gr}}(a,b,\mathbf{d}) = \frac{1+\epsilon_a}{1+\epsilon_b}\frac{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_b)}{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_a)}\left(1+\frac{\epsilon_a-\epsilon_b}{(1-\mu)^2}\left(\sigma^p-\frac{\mu}{n}\right)\right).$$

We use some additional notation for bipartite and digraph case: $\sigma^p_A = \sum_{a=1}^n \epsilon_a^2$ and $\sigma^p_B = \sum_{v=n+1}^{n+m} \epsilon_v^2$ (this is the σ^p as defined above).

The formulae for ratios for bipartite graphs are

$$P^{\mathrm{bip}}_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = \mu(1+\epsilon_a)(1+\epsilon_v)\left(1-\mu\epsilon_a\epsilon_v+\frac{\epsilon_v\sigma^p_A+\epsilon_a\sigma^p_B}{1-\mu}\right)$$

$$R^{\mathrm{bip}}(a,b,\mathbf{d}) = \frac{1+\epsilon_a}{1+\epsilon_b}\frac{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_b)}{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_a)}\left(1+\frac{\epsilon_a-\epsilon_b}{(1-\mu)^2}\left(\sigma^p-\frac{1+\mu(1-\mu)}{n}-\frac{\mu}{m}\right)\right).$$

The formulae for probabilities and ratios for digraphs are

$$P^{\mathrm{di}}_{av} = \mu(1+\epsilon_a)(1+\epsilon_v)\left(1-\mu\epsilon_a\epsilon_v+\frac{\epsilon_v\sigma^p_A+\epsilon_a\sigma^p_B}{1-\mu}+\frac{\epsilon_v+\epsilon_a^+}{n}\right)$$

(Note that $a \in [n]$, and $v \in [n+m]$, i.e. ϵ_a refers to an out degree whereas ϵ_v refers to an in degree.)

$$R^{\mathrm{di}}(a,b,\mathbf{d}) = \frac{1+\epsilon_a}{1+\epsilon_b}\frac{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_b)}{1-\mu(1+\epsilon_a)}\left(1+\frac{\epsilon_a-\epsilon_b}{(1-\mu)^2}\left(\sigma^p-\frac{1}{n}\right)+\frac{\epsilon_a^+-\epsilon_b^+}{n(1-\mu)}\right).$$

The strengthened version of Lemma 8.1 which we obtain by using the previous argument and expanding to further terms is as follows.

Lemma 9.1. *Make the assumptions as in Lemma* 8.1*, with the exception that* $\sigma^p = O(1/N)$ *is no longer required. Assume additionally that* $\epsilon = O(d^\alpha)$ *where* $\alpha < 3/5$*. Then*

(a) $\mathcal{R}(P^*)(a,b,\mathbf{d}) = R^*(a,b,\mathbf{d})\left(1+o\left(1/d^{1/2+\phi}n\right)\right)$,

(b) $\mathcal{P}(P^*,R^*)_{av}(\mathbf{d}) = P^*_{av}(\mathbf{d})\left(1+o\left(1/d^{1/2+\phi}n\right)\right)$.

This provides the necessary results to extend all our (for graphs, bipartite graphs and digraphs) to the range of degrees covered by this lemma.

References

[1] A.D. Barbour, L. Holst and S. Janson, *Poisson Approximation*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1992.

[2] A. Barvinok and J.A. Hartigan, The number of graphs and a random graph with a given degree sequence, *Adv. Math.* **224**(1) (2010), 316–339.

[3] A. Békéssy, P. Békéssy, and J. Komlós, Asymptotic enumeration of regular matrices, *Stud. Sci. Math. Hungar* **7** (1972), 343–353.

[4] E.A. Bender and E.R. Canfield, The asymptotic number of labeled graphs with given degree sequences, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* **24**(3) (1978), 296–307.

[5] B. Bollobás, *Random Graphs,* Academic Press, 1985 (Second Edition 2001).

[6] D. Burstein and J. Rubin, Degree switching and partitioning for enumerating graphs to arbitrary orders of accuracy. arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.03738 (2015).

[7] E.R. Canfield, C. Greenhill C and B.D. McKay. Asymptotic enumeration of dense 0-1 matrices with specified line sums, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A.* **115** (2008), 32–66.

[8] T.I. Fenner and A.M. Frieze, Hamiltonian cycles in random regular graphs, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* **37**(2) (1984), 103–112.

[9] C. Greenhill, B.D. McKay and X. Wang, Asymptotic enumeration of sparse 0-1 matrices with irregular row and column sums, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **113** (2006), 291–324.

[10] M. Isaev and B.D. McKay, Complex martingales and asymptotic enumeration, Math arXiv:1604.08305.

[11] S. Janson, T. Łuczak, and A. Ruciński, *Random graphs*, Wiley, New York, 2000.

[12] M. Koren, Extreme degree sequences of simple graphs, *J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B* **15** (1973), 213–224.

[13] B.D. McKay, Asymptotics for symmetric 0-1 matrices with prescribed row sums, *Ars Combin.* **19** (1985), 15–25.

[14] B.D. McKay and X. Wang, Asymptotic enumeration of 0-1 matrices with equal row sums and equal column sums, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **373** (2003), 273–287.

[15] B.D. McKay and N.C. Wormald, Asymptotic enumeration by degree sequence of graphs with degrees $o(n^{1/2})$, *Combinatorica* **11** (1991) 369–382.

[16] B.D. McKay and N.C. Wormald, Asymptotic enumeration by degree sequence of graphs of high degree, *Europ. J. Combinatorics* **11** (1990), 565–580.

[17] B.D. McKay and N.C. Wormald, The degree sequence of a random graph. I. The models, *Random Structures& Algorithms* **11** (1997), 97–117.

[18] L. Mirsky, *Transversal Theory*, Academic Press, New York, 1971.